

SPANISH OBJECT PRONOUNS OF THE THIRD PERSON

by

Aldis B. Easterling

Submitted to the Department of Hispanic Languages and Literatures and the Faculty of the Graduate School of the University of Kansas in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

Approved by:

Arthur L. Owen

Department of Hispanic
Languages and Literatures.

June 1, 1922.

I wish to take this opportunity
to express my sincere appreciation
of the constant assistance,
interest and encouragement given
by Professor Arthur L. Owen, which
has made this study possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|---------|
| INTRODUCTION | Page 1. |
| Derivation - Beginnings of Confusion- Los casos enclíticos y proclíticos, R. J. Cuervo. | |
| CHAPTER I | 25. |
| The pronouns of the masculine accusative, singular and plural. | |
| CHAPTER II | 42. |
| Other Non-Etymological Distinctions and applications. <u>Le</u> masculine accusative for persons and things - <u>le</u> for animals - <u>Le</u> feminine accusative - <u>Lo</u> for babies, things and persons - <u>Lo</u> neuter - <u>Lo</u> and <u>los</u> dative- <u>La</u> and <u>las</u> as indefinite pronouns. | |
| CHAPTER III | 59. |
| The pronouns in combination with other pronouns of the third person - <u>Se</u> (<u>ge</u>) - <u>Se</u> reflexive - Impersonal constructions with reflexive <u>se</u> . | |
| CONCLUSION | 75. |
| Grammar of the Academy, edition of 1920 - Gramática histórico-crítica, Padilla. | |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY | |
| INDEX | |

SPANISH OBJECT PRONOUNS OF THE THIRD PERSON

INTRODUCTION

This study offers no solution of the well known controversy concerning the object pronouns of the third person in Spanish, but rather a review of the origin of these forms, the divergence that has arisen in their use, and, by comparison, the tendency or tendencies manifested.

The latin object pronouns illum, illam gave in Spanish, by the dropping of the initial vowel and simplification of the double consonant, masculine lo, feminine la, for the accusative of persons or things. In the same way illos, illas gave the masculine plural los and feminine las and illi, illis gave the dative masculine and feminine le singular, les plural. Examples of li, lis are found in Berceo.

There is some difference of opinion as to the steps or course of derivation of the dative pronoun se before another object pronoun of the third person, from the latin illi illud. Hanssen¹ says, quoting the opinion of Lenz, "ge lo derives from illi illud and the intermediate form was li elo, and adds that it would be more correct to write g—elo.

While according to Menéndez Pidal,² when the dative is united to the accusative of the same pronoun (dedit illi illum) old Spanish uses the form gelo,-s, gela,-s, which shows the regular development from illi-illu>(i)lliello>gello and with the

1. Gramática histórica de la lengua castellana, Halle 1913, p. 76.
2. Manual de gramática histórica española, Fourth edition, Madrid 1918, p. 197.

reduction of the ll, gelo.

Ford ³ gives another course of derivation from the latin in the following discussion of the development se from ge:-

"It (se) was originally the latin dative illi before an accusative illum, illam, etc.; hence illi illum 'it to him' > (il)li_o el(1)o > lyelo > ielo, -the stage of italian glielo, > with the total absorption of the l element by the palatal y (cf. Fr. fille > fi.y) yelo >, as the y was very palatal, i.e. produced with a very narrow passageway between the tongue and the palate, and therefore with much friction, gelo, i.e. dzelo; cf. dialectical and American Spanish jo = džo for yo. The dental element in ge = dž disappeared ere long, hence ž, and in the late old Spanish period all voiced sibilants unvoiced, hence š = Eng. sh. The spelling ge still continued largely, but the spelling xe is found beside it, and old Spanish x = š, i.e. sh. At the stage xe, i.e. še, confusion with the reflexive se seems to have set in, partly because the Spanish s was then so cacuminal as almost to be palatal, i.e. it approximated greatly to xe, she, and partly an aversion to the use of initial x, or g meaning x, showed itself, and s, as the sign nearest in value recommended itself. So it is that the confusion of se, reflexive, and ge, xe, not reflexive, but simply dative, became absolute, and in modern Spanish se does duty for both words."

Cejador y Frauca ⁴ points out the same influence of the reflexive se, which was retained in Spanish from the latin.

In the earliest monuments of Spanish literature the

3. Old Spanish Readings, New York, 1911, p. 286.

4. La Lengua de Cervantes, Madrid, 1905, p. 312.

beginning of the confusion in the use of the third person object pronouns is found.

⁵ Pidal finds that le and les are generally dative in the Poema del Cid, but that there are cases of both le and les used in the accusative for persons and even for animals and things. In his opinion this is due to the influence of the pronouns me and te which, serving for both accusative and dative, would tend to attract a similar ending to the pronouns of the third person. Fernando Araujo Gómez in his Gramática del Poema del Cid ⁶ states that there is some difficulty in the construction of these pronouns but that in general it can be said that the forms lo, la, los, las are reserved for things in the accusative and that the forms le, les are employed ordinarily for the indirect object. ⁷ Cejador finds that Cervantes uses:-

le and lo Sing. Acc. Mas. with preference for le
les and los Plu. Acc. Mas. with preference for los
la and le Sing. Acc. Fem. with preference for la
las Plu. Acc. Fem.
le Sing. Dat. Mas.
les and los Plu. Dat. Mas. ordinarily les
le and la Sing. Dat. Fem. with preference for le
les Plu. Dat. Fem. very rarely las.

⁸ Cuervo shows that grammarians have differed widely in opinion as to the proper use of these pronouns; ⁹ Nebrija considered them as pertaining to a nominative lo

5. Cantar de Mio Cid, Madrid, 1908, vol. 1, p. 321.

6. Memorias de la Academia Española, Madrid, 1896, vol. 7, p. 144.

7. Op. Cit., p. 312.

8. Los Casos Enclíticos y Proclíticos del Pronombre de Tercera Persona en Castellano, Romania XXIV, 1895, p. 95.

9. Gramática, Salamanca, 1492.

(later he says él), la, lo, which has never existed. He classified le and les as dative and accusative pronouns common to the three genders, masculine, feminine and neuter.

The grammarians of the sixteenth century were also deficient in their treatment of the problem. The first work cited by Cuervo gives only the periphrastic forms a él, a ella and the accusative identical with the nominative. Another gives the accusatives le, la, lo, corresponding to the nominatives él, ella, ello and los, las to ellos, ellas; for the dative the combinations a él, a ella, a ello, etc. Juan de Miranda treats lo as a relative.

Juan Martín Cordero says that le and les usually refer to persons or to such pronouns as yo, tú, aquél while lo and los always refer to things, but that there is great confusion in their use. In the examples given in the paragraph quoted by Cuervo le and les are used datively and lo and los accusatively.

In the XVII century Micer Andrés Rey de Artieda defended the distinction of gender rather than of case and regarded lo as neuter, le masculine and la feminine giving the following as an example of the correct use of these forms:

"Iua Laura delante, conocila;
Iua detras don Feliz, y alcancele;
Lo demás del suceso callarelo."

He condemned the use of lo in the masculine by Garcilaso.

-
10. La Vtil, y breve institution, para aprender los principios, y fundamentos de la lengua hespanola (Louvain, 1555).
 11. Gramática de la lengua vulgar de España, Louvain, 1559.
 12. Osservationi della lingua castigliana, Venice, 1595, p.17.
 13. Chapter on "La manera de escribir en castellana," in, Las Quexas y llantos de Pompeyo, Antwerp, 1556.
 14. Preface, Discursos, epístolas y epigramas de Artemidoro, Zaragoza, 1605

Oudin ¹⁵ and Juan de Luna ¹⁶ give only the perifrastic declension, a él, a ella. John Minsheu ¹⁷ does the same but cites examples of le and lo. Ambrosio de Salazar ¹⁸ gives only a ella and la in the accusative but gives examples using lo for both persons and things in the masculine accusative and le, les, also accusatives.

Gonzalo Correás ¹⁹ discusses the question at length and gives the following forms: in the singular, masculine le, feminine la, neuter lo; in the plural, les and los masculine, las feminine. He attributed the office of the masculine Accusative to le and that of the feminine dative to la, las. He also sanctioned the use of los for les in the masculine dative. These usages arise from the tendency to depreciate the distinction of cases in favor of the distinction of gender, and possibly to the influence of provincialism as great rivalry existed between students in Salamanca, where Correás was teaching, concerning the speech of their respective provinces.

Carlos Rodríguez ²⁰ declared that le is dative and accusative and that la fulfills the same office for the feminine gender. Franciosini ²¹ expressing the same view, adds that lo should only be used as a neuter pronoun, los being masculine plural although one might expect him to favor les.

P. Juan de Villar ²², an Andalusian, held that le, les

15. Grammaire espagnolle expliquée en françois, Brussels, 1610.

16. Arte breve y compendiosa para aprender a leer, escrevir pronunciar i hablar la lengua española, London, 1623.

17. Gramática Española de Percival aumentada por J. Minsheu, London 1599.

18. Espejo general de la Gramática, Rouen, 1622.

19. Trilingüe de tres artes de las tres lenguas castellana, latina i griega, Salamanca, 1627.

20. Linguae Hispanicae Compendium, Copenhagen, 1662.

21. Grammatica spagnuola ed italana, second edition, Rome, 1638.

22. Arte de la lengua española, etc., Valencia, 1651.

had always been dative and that sometimes carelessness in writing caused the use of a dative form in the place of an accusative.

In the XVIII century Benito Martínez Gómez ²³ gave for the dative and accusative singular, le, la, lo, and for the plural, les, las, los, which statement Cuervo does not consider surprising since the author does not distinguish the cases of the substantive.

P. Benito de San Pedro ²⁴ is also lacking in clearness but Cuervo gathers that in the accusative he places le and lo for the masculine singular, les and los for the plural, la and las feminine singular and plural. For the feminine dative he advocates the use of la but uses les in one of his examples. Like Correas ²⁵ he thought le and les were used only to refer to personal pronouns or to names of persons.

Garcés, ²⁶ who was concerned with the exposition of the use among classic writers, recognized that the masculine accusative was le or lo in the singular, los plural with no mention of les; that the dative masculine and feminine is le, les but that la is admissible especially when required for clearness. He admits the use of lo in the dative, but Cuervo finds that his example is not conclusive because it is used with the verb servir which may also take the accusative.

In the first edition of Grammar of the Academy (1771), le prevails in the accusative and la is frequently found in the dative. Cuervo explains this by the presence of many Castilians

23. Gramática de la lengua castellana, Madrid, 1743.

24. Arte del romance castellano, Valencia, 1769.

25. Vide supra, p.5.

26. Fundamento del vigor y elegancia de la lengua castellana, Madrid, 1791.

and of many others who wrote in Castilian. This use of le and la, with the admission of les as an accusative, showed that there was no fixed rule for the use of these forms. This condition existed until the appearance of the fourth edition of the Grammar of the Academy in 1796, when the Academy condemned the use of la, las and los in the dative and of les in the accusative. Only in the case of the masculine singular accusative did it fail to uphold the etymological use of these forms. Lo was considered neuter; its use in the masculine was condemned and le was given the office of the masculine accusative singular.

The controversy reached such proportions that two distinct parties or groups were formed. The leístas argued that in words like este, esta, esto those ending in -e are always masculine, those in -a feminine and those in -o neuter. They overlooked the fact however that in the demonstratives the terminations correspond to the nominative of the latin demonstratives from which they are derived, while the accusative of the pronoun derives from the latin accusative forms. Neither did they take notice of the fact that the accusative office is adventitious in le, since its origin and first use were dative. They also alleged that the use of lo with certain verbs was "obscene," failing to acknowledge that in all languages there are words of more than one meaning which though obscene in some relations are used freely by decorous persons without danger of such obscene meanings being attached to them.

In reply to these attacks the loístas, aside from etymological reasons, advocated the advantage of distinguishing
27
between the accusative and dative cases.

27. Hermosilla, Arte de hablar, Paris 1850, and Salvá, Gramática, edition of 1849, note 1.

The most enthusiastic leistas at times used lo and the Academy itself was not very careful in observing its own rule. In view of this state of affairs, Salvá studied the practice among modern writers and proposed that le be used for living beings and lo for inanimate objects. In spite of much opposition, he maintained the same position in each edition of his grammar. His idea met with favor, however, and Bello adopted it in the first edition of his grammar²⁸ as that which conformed most nearly to practice. He later modified this by saying that it seemed to approximate, to some extent, the best usage. The doctrine rather than a fact seems to represent the tendency of certain writers.

In 1847 D. Alejandro Oliván, an Aragonese, gave the following arguments in support of his contention that the precept which attributes exclusively to le the office of the accusative was insustainable:²⁹

1. Lo is generally the masculine accusative of él.
2. Le is a concession or a privilege only admissible for the sake of euphony or a particular meaning of the verb toward the noun represented by the pronoun.
3. Seldom or never would le be suitable for the accusative pronoun referring to things.
4. Even in the case of the pronoun referring to persons or another living or at least organic being, the accusative should not be used when the noun in an equivalent case would take the definite article el, but only when the article al would be required, and then only in the case

28. Gramática de la lengua castellana, Madrid, 1847.

29. Address before Royal Academy, Nov. 7, 1847.

of a concrete, determined act impressing the mind as the act itself would impress it if witnessed.

He considered that it was better to distinguish cases by using lo in the accusative and le in the dative than to distinguish gender by the use of le and lo in the accusative and le and la in the dative.

Martínez de la Rosa, replying to Oliván, defended the position of the Academy but as an Andalusian he did not disapprove of lo in the accusative. Two other addresses were given on the question at this time and the pronoun lo was used by each of the four speakers including the director of the Academy.

In the edition of 1854, the Academy mentioned the controversy and the proposal made by Salva, and confessed that the use was not as uniform as was to be desired, and renounced the exclusive use of le in the accusative singular. In the edition of 1858, it ruled that either le or lo was admissible without giving preference for either. The exclusion of les from the accusative was reiterated. The use of le as feminine dative was confirmed, with the observation that la had been used in the dative by good writers to avoid ambiguity. In later editions of the Grammar, the Academy has expressly condemned the use of les in the accusative and declared that the use of la and las in the dative should not be imitated. In regard to the liberty authorized in the use of le and lo in the accusative, the editions of 1870 and 1874 observed that many of the most correct writers avoided the use of lo in reference to persons and warned against the danger of dissonance that might occur in the use of lo, e.g. lo colocó or colocolo. As these ideas correspond to those expressed by Oliván it is

probable that they were introduced into the Grammar through his influence. The fact that in the edition of 1880, after the death of Oliván, the Academy returned to the fullest liberty in the use of le and extended the warning concerning dissonance to all pronouns in combination, is considered by Cuervo as further evidence of the influence of Oliván. In the edition of its Dictionary of 1884 the Academy gave le the preference over lo when referring to persons.

The defense of la, las as dative pronouns was renewed³⁰ with the allegation that such was the use in Castile and Leon but, with the exception of a few authors, Cuervo finds that it rarely occurs in the work of Spanish writers and that it is unnecessary even for the sake of clearness, for the use of the forms a ella, a ellas more clearly removes any ambiguity that may exist.

Cuervo classes the causes contributing to the confusion under two groups: morphological and syntactical.

Under morphological influence he points out that in old Spanish the forms me, te, se, frequently suppressed the e leaving the consonant joined to the preceeding word as its final letter. A lo quem semeia³¹. These forms were used in the dative and accusative cases alike. In the case of l' Cuervo finds, up to the middle of the XVI century, 160 cases in which it is used in the masculine dative, 70 in which it is masculine accusative and 13 feminine dative and that there does not occur a single case of this form for the neuter lo;

30. Valbuena, Fe de erratas del diccionario de la Academia, Madrid, 1891, p. 27.

31. Cid, 157.

that texts which seldom or never use le in the masculine accusative, do use l' accusatively in the masculine, and that l', therefore, is not a case of apocopation identical with that of un, uno, algún, alguno, for the reason that the neuter does not suffer the change. Nor, he argues, is it identical with that of grand, grande, as the l' is used in texts that do not use le. If this is true, it is probable that there was no thought of apocopation of the le or the lo but rather of producing a combination, as nol, that would correspond to the forms nom, not, nos, found in old Spanish for no me, no te, no se. If this influence has existed, it is not unlikely, since in the case of me, te, se the offices of dative and accusative were combined, that these forms should tend to influence the form le, which is most similar to them, also to combine the two cases in the one form: me, te, se, le pone la carga encima, in which the pronoun is dative, and me, te, se, le pone encima de la mesa, in which it is accusative.

The same necessity of distinction of gender that kept the lo neuter has also preserved the la feminine accusative. The absorption of lo by le being well founded in popular use, the step to les for los was easy. Then, the distinction obliterated, the opposite use of lo, los and la, las for the dative le, les followed, but has never gained the prestige necessary to become general. Cuervo adds that the region in which le predominates over lo is that in which the greatest number of subrogations have occurred, which would emphasize the probability of this as a source of confusion. He further points out that among Americans he has never heard la for le nor los for les,

and that Bello is inclined to consider the examples of los for les as errors, which opinion Cuervo cites as evidence that Bello was not accustomed to such usage.

The following causes are due to syntax:

I. There are a considerable number of verbs that are constructed at times with the accusative of persons, and again with the accusative of things;

"aconsejar a los niños."

"aconsejar la retirada."

The result is that the pronoun referring to persons sometimes appears in the dative and sometimes in the accusative;

"los aconseja para que sean modestos."

"les aconseja la modestia."

Moreover as many verbs like advertir, decir, anunciar, comunicar are usually used with the dative of the person, it is not strange that one should fall into the error of using the dative form in an accusative construction, as;

"advertirle del peligro,"

instead of,

"advertirlo del peligro,"

because of the much used construction, "advertirle el peligro."

II. Transitive verbs are also often used unrestrictedly, as; eso cansa, or, eso fatiga which use is equivalent to the use of another verb modified by an accusative corresponding to the meaning of the first verb, as;

"eso me da cansancio."

In this way Cuervo explains among other cases of le feminine accusative, the following from Roa:

"Le asombra la muerte."

III. The reverse of this also occurs, that is, a phrase formed of a verb in its usual meaning followed by an accusative is taken to be equivalent to another transitive verb. Thus;

"Los quitó las vidas," (los dative),

in which quitó las vidas is taken as equivalent to mató, which gives the sentence;

"Los mató (los accusative).

IV. The assimilation of the meaning of a transitive verb to that of another intransitive one produces imitation in construction: which may be observed in the case of verbs used unrestrictedly mentioned above; thus coger, tomar are similar to sobrevenir, escuchar to dar oídos:

"Les cogió la muerte en el" (en aquel pecado mortal). ³²

V. With certain verbs governing the infinitive there is great confusion in the accusative and dative. In phrases like,

"las vió salir,

las oyó cantar,

the pronouns are accusative whether the verb in the infinitive be transitive or intransitive. If, however, an object of the infinitive is added to the phrase, the construction is changed and the pronoun becomes dative. Instead of las, with the phrase having the verb cantar, we have les.

32. Guevara, M. Aur. III, 4 (fol. 140 V : Sevilla, 1531).

"les oyó cantar dos arias," ³³

les dejó decir el diálogo."

These latter sentences are similar to such normal ones as;

"les oyó la conversación,"

which constructions occur frequently. Hence the sentences first mentioned, las vió salir, las oyó cantar, came to be regarded as if the infinitive were accusative and the pronoun dative;

les vió salir, instead of, las vió salir.

This assimilation is extended to cases in which the infinitive is preceded by a preposition;

"les enseña a rezar," analagous to, "les enseña la doctrina!"

For the same reason the pronouns se le, se les, are found in impersonal expressions where under the circumstances it is probable that one would say se la, se las:-

"Las cortes dieron un testimonio inaigne de prudencia, eludienda la edición fatal, sin anticipar por eso----el juicio que se reservaban para ocasión más oportuna, si acaso se les obligaba a pronunciarle." ³⁴

VI. It is the tendency in Spanish to convert the accusative into the dative when it is modified by a word which refers to it as an attribute or predicate, this word coming to be considered as the true accusative. The confusion extends to the placing of the preposition a before the accusative even of things;

33. Bello, Gramática, Paris, 1916, Par. 1100.

34. Argüelles, Examen histórico de la reforma constitucional, tomo 1, p. 331, Madrid, 1864.

"Llama bueno a lo útil."

Hace masculinos a los nombres acabados en o."

In such cases the pronoun is found in the dative.

VII. General euphonic considerations and the use of both pronouns to avoid monotony have also contributed to the confusion.

The influence of the preposition a in such sentences as, conoce al señor García, to point out the object is passed over very lightly by Cuervo in this discussion, indicating only the similarity of the use of the dative form with nouns, to the invasion of the masculine pronoun into the field of the dative in the case of the l'.

Notwithstanding the slight importance attached to this by Cuervo, it would seem to constitute one of the main causes of the confusion arising from syntax, and is the only cause
35
mentioned by Meyer-Lübke.

In summary of his discussion of the causes of confusion, Cuervo says that in the greater number of the regions in which Castilian is spoken, the etymological use prevails. He shows, however, that the confusion between the accusative lo and dative le, having arisen through morphological causes, has been extended through syntactical causes and finally through abusive use, until the le predominates in the usual speech of Castile, whence, on account of political and literary influence of the capital, it has penetrated the written language of the provinces; that these same syntactical causes worked in the plural and in the feminine, but without realizing such complete changes, on account of not being accompanied by morpho-

logical influences; and finally that the distinction between the cases having been dimmed through these conditions, the forms have come to be applied indiscriminately, more attention being paid to the distinction of gender than to that of case; that when in one field two forms of identical value are used, it usually happens that one form overcomes the other, which then disappears, or differentiation takes place, the two forms being applied in different ways. But the fact that the divergence is, in a way, a regional matter, makes this method of solution difficult if not impossible. Salvá, and later the Academy, tried to solve this in the region in which it chiefly exists with the rule that lo should be used for things and le for persons. Cuervo closes this section with the statement that it remains to be seen whether current use in Castile follows this course.

Cuervo examined selections from 89 authors from the earliest times to 1889. This examination was for the most part limited to from fifty to one hundred pages of the work of each author. The following table gives his results in the accusative singular for persons and things.

| | <u>lo</u> | <u>le</u> |
|--|-----------|-----------|
| Fuero de Madrid, año 1202 (Mem. Acad. Hist. VIII) .. | 47 | — |
| Poema de los Reyes Magos (Baist) | 7 | — |
| | 36 | |
| Berceo, <u>Vida de S. Domingo</u> , 1000 versos (R. LVII) .. | 42 | 6 |
| <u>Poema amatorio, Debate del vino y del agua, De los diez mandamientos (navarro-aragoneses)</u> (Romania, XVI) | 9 | — |
| <u>Libro de Alexandre</u> , 1000 versos (R. LVII) | 58 | 2 |

| | <u>10</u> | <u>1e</u> |
|---|-----------|-----------|
| <u>Poema de Fernán González</u> , 1000 versos (R. LVII).. | 18 | 6 |
| <u>Fuero Juzgo</u> , pp. 24-37, and 45-59 (Madrid, 1815)... | 39 | 1 |
| <u>Espéculo</u> , lib. 1, hasta la pág. 12 (Ed. Acad. Hist.)..... | 13 | 10 |
| <u>Cid</u> , 1000 versos (Vollmöller)..... | 23 | 7 |
| <u>Arc. de Hita</u> , 1000 versos (R. LVII)..... | 22 | 11 |
| <u>Cortes de Alcalá</u> , año 1348 (<u>Cortes de León y Castilla</u> , tomo 1, pp. 500-535)..... | 33 | 3 |
| <u>Yáñez</u> , <u>Poema de Alfonso Onceno</u> , 365 redondillas (R. LVII)..... | 24 | 2 |
| <u>Leyenda de Plácidas</u> (Soc. Bib. Esp. tomo XVII)... | 61 | 1 |
| <u>López de Ayala</u> , <u>Rimado de Palacio</u> , 1000 versos (R. LVII)..... | 34 | 21 |
| <u>Tostado</u> , <u>De como al omc es necesario amar</u> (Soc. Bibl. Esp. Vol. XXIX)..... | 13 | 3 |
| <u>M. de Santillana</u> , <u>Carta al Condestable de Portugal</u> , <u>Comedietade Ponza</u> , <u>Bias contra Fortuna</u> , (Madrid, 1852)..... | 19 | 2 |
| <u>Cancionero de Gómez Manrique</u> , 100 págs. del tomo 1 (Madrid, 1885)..... | 14 | 4 |
| <u>Cancionero de Elena</u> , 20 fols. ms. 37 Esp. Bibl. Nac. de París..... | 13 | 1 |
| <u>Lucena</u> , <u>De vida beata</u> , 45 págs. (Soc. Bibl. Esp. tomo XXIX)..... | 51 | 7 |
| <u>Celestina</u> , <u>Dedicatoria</u> , <u>aeróstico</u> , acto 1 (Sevilla 1501)..... | 7 | 22 |
| <u>Testamento de Isabel la Católica</u> , 12 de Octubre de 1504 (<u>Dormer</u> , <u>Discursos varios de historia</u> , Zaragoza, 1685)..... | 43 | — |
| <u>Encina</u> (salmantino), <u>Cancionero</u> , fols 1-13 (Zaragoza, 1516)..... | 18 | 33 |
| <u>Torres Naharro</u> (extremeño), <u>Propaladia</u> , pról., pces. hasta el fin del Cap. VI, y la <u>Serafina</u> (Sevilla, 1533)..... | 41 | 4 |

| | <u>10</u> | <u>1e</u> |
|---|-----------|-----------|
| Guevara (vizoaino), Marco Aurelio, fols. 135-147, (Sevilla, 1531)..... | 8 | 26 |
| Boscán (catalán), <u>El cortesano</u> , fols. 2-10 (Barcelona, 1534)..... | 1 | 69 |
| Celso, <u>Reportorio de las leyes de Castilla</u> , pról. y fols. 100-106 (Valladolid, 1538). | 15 | 31 |
| <u>Amadís de Gaula</u> , pról., preámb. y tres caps. del libro 1 (Sevilla, 1539)..... | 63 | 24 |
| Mejía (sevillano), <u>Silua de varia lecion</u> , fols. 1-9 (Sevilla, 1542)..... | 27 | 5 |
| Venegas (toledano), <u>Diferencias de libros</u> , fols. 1-21 (Toledo, 1546)..... | 1 | 47 |
| Id. <u>Agonía del tránsito de la muerte</u> , fols. 1-21 (Valladolid, 1583)..... | 2 | 20 |
| Garcilaso (toledano), fols. 219-251. (Venecia, 1553)..... | 6 | 11 |
| Morales (cordobés), <u>Corónica de España</u> , fols. 13-25 (Alcalá, 1574)..... | 36 | 26 |
| Gil Polo (valenciano), <u>Diana</u> , el libro 11 (Amberes, 1574)..... | 32 | 5 |
| Abril (alcaraceño), <u>Las seis comedias de Terencio</u> , los dos primeros actos de la <u>Andria</u> (Zaragoza, 1577)..... | 19 | 8 |
| Santa Teresa (avilesa), <u>Vida</u> , seis caps. hasta el folio 51 de la reproducción fototipográfica del autógrafo (Madrid, 1873)..... | — | 36 |
| León (conquense), <u>Nombres de Cristo</u> , lib. III, fols. 232-262 (Barcelona, 1587, reprod. de la edic. de Salamanca, 1585, y conforme con la 4 de esta misma ciudad, 1595)..... | 25 | 69 |
| Pérez de Oliva (cordobés), <u>La vengança de Agamenon</u> (<u>Obras</u> , Cordoba, 1586)..... | 40 | 3 |
| Granada (granadino), <u>Vida del P. Avila</u> (en las Obras de éste, Madrid, 1588), dedic. y fols. 1-21..... | 13 | 12 |
| Sigüenza (seguntino), <u>Vida de S. Jerónimo</u> , pp. 1-40 (Madrid, 1595)..... | 5 | 26 |

| | | |
|---|----|-----|
| Virués (Valenciano), <u>Monserate, tres cantos</u> (Milan, 1602)..... | 2 | 35 |
| Aldrete (malagueño), <u>Del origen y principio de la</u> <u>lengua castellana, pp. 1-50</u> (Roma, 1606)..... | 8 | 9 |
| Jáuregui (sevillano), <u>Aminta</u> , (Rome, 1607)..... | 42 | 21 |
| Mariana (talaverano), <u>Historia general de</u> <u>España, pról. y pp. 1-31</u> (Madrid, 1608)..... | 1 | 50 |
| Pérez Sigler (salmantino), <u>Metam. de Ovidio,</u> <u>fols. 215-244</u> (Burgos, 1609)..... | 10 | 29 |
| Ledesma (segoviano), <u>Conceptos espirituales,</u> <u>pp. 1-51</u> (Madrid, 1609)..... | 7 | 42 |
| Cervantes (alcaláino), <u>Novelas</u> , fols. 1-30 (Madrid, 1613)..... | 2 | 101 |
| Diego López (de Valencia de Alcántara, Extre- madura), <u>Declaración magistral sobre las</u> <u>emblemas de Alciato, pp. 6-26</u> (Nájera, 1615).. | 8 | 29 |
| Cascales (murciano), <u>Tablas poéticas, pp. 1-60</u> (Murcia, 1617)..... | 2 | 15 |
| Roa (cordobés), <u>Vida y maravillosas virtudes</u> <u>de Da. Sancha Carrillo de Córdoba, el libro</u> <u>I</u> (Sevilla, 1615)..... | 42 | 29 |
| Jménez Patón (de Almedina, Ciudad Real), <u>Mer-</u> <u>curius trimegistus, fols. 48-77,</u> (Baeza, 1621)..... | 10 | 22 |
| Alemán (sevillano), <u>Guzmán de Alfarache, fols.</u> <u>1-10</u> (Búrgos, 1619)..... | 23 | 3 |
| Lope (madrileño), <u>Gatomaquia (Rimas de Burguillos,</u> <u>Madrid, 1634)</u> | — | 63 |
| L. y B. Argensola (aragoneses), <u>Rimas, pp. 1-51,</u> <u>157-183</u> (Zaragoza, 1634)..... | 33 | 14 |
| Tirso (madrileño), <u>Deleitar aprovechando, 15 fols.</u> (Madrid, 1635)..... | — | 39 |
| Colmenares (segoviano), <u>Historia de Segovia, pp.</u> <u>350-370</u> (Segovia, 1637)..... | — | 24 |
| Calderón (madrileño), <u>El maxico prodigioso</u> (1637 : Heilbronn, 1877)..... | 2 | 101 |
| Quevedo (madrileño), <u>Vida de Marco Bruto, fols.</u> <u>1-54</u> (Madrid, 1644)..... | — | 115 |

| | | |
|--|----|----|
| López de Zárate (logroñés), <u>Invenzion de la Cruz</u> <u>tres libros</u> (Madrid, 1648)..... | 16 | 18 |
| Saavedra (murciano), <u>Empresas</u> , pról., dedic. y tres empresas (Amberes y Amsterdam, 1659; Valencia, 1675)..... | 3 | 16 |
| Melo (portugués), <u>Obras métricas</u> , prelims. y pp. 1-20, 100-120 (Leon de Francia, 1665)..... | 10 | 77 |
| Solís (alcaláino), <u>Triunfos de Amor y Fortuna</u> (<u>Comedias</u> , Madrid, 1681)..... | 2 | 60 |
| Ferreras (leonés), <u>Sinopsis histórica</u> , tomo 1 pp. 1-80 (Madrid, 1700)..... | 1 | 28 |
| <u>Hist. de la Academia Española</u> (Dicc. Autor. Mad- rid, 1726)..... | — | 27 |
| Nazarre (aragonés), prólogo a las Comedias de Cervantes (Madrid, 1749)..... | 9 | 10 |
| <u>Discurso sobre el fomento de la industria pop- ular</u> (de Campomanes, (asturiano), 100 págs. (Madrid, 1774)..... | 1 | 26 |
| Luzán (aragonés), <u>Poética</u> , tomo 1, pp. LV-LX, 1-60 (2d.ed. Madrid, 1789)..... | 1 | 16 |
| Meléndez (extremeño), <u>Cartas a Jovellanos</u> , pp. pp. 73-85 (R. LXIII)..... | 24 | 28 |
| Capmany (catalán), <u>Teatro de la elocuencia</u> , tomo 1, 80 págs. (Madrid, 1786)..... | 21 | 6 |
| Samaniego (alavés), <u>Fábulas</u> , pról. y 40 fábs. (Valencia, 1781)..... | 27 | 5 |
| Iriarte (canario), <u>Fábulas</u> , 40 fábs. (1782 : Obras, Madrid, 1805)..... | 1 | 15 |
| Jovellanos (asturiano), <u>Memoria sobre diversion- es públicas</u> , pp. 360-398 (Mem. Acad. Hist. V. Madrid, 1817)..... | 1 | 27 |
| Quintana (madrileño), <u>Poesías</u> , 114 págs. (Madrid, 1813)..... | 3 | 39 |
| Reinoso (Sevillano), <u>Examen de los delitos de infidelidad a la patria</u> , pp. LV-XLV, 1-53 (Burdeos, 1818)..... | 5 | 36 |
| Flórez Estrada (asturiano), <u>Curso de Economía política</u> , tomo 1, pp. 5-72 (Londres, 1828) | 8 | 11 |

| | <u>10</u> | <u>1e</u> |
|---|-----------|-----------|
| Lista (sevillano), <u>Historia universal de Segur</u> , tomo 1, pp. 5-67 (Madrid, 1830)..... | 24 | 25 |
| Clemencín (murciano), <u>Comentario</u> , tomo 1, pp. V-LXX (Madrid, 1833)..... | 19 | 13 |
| Bermúdez de Castro (gaditano), <u>Antonio Pérez</u> , pp. 7-79 (Madrid, 1841)..... | 12 | 47 |
| Mesonero (madrileño), <u>Manual de Madrid</u> , pp. 3-60 (Madrid, 1844)..... | 1 | 35 |
| Bretón (logroñés), <u>¿Quién es ella?</u> (1849: Obras, Madrid, 1850)..... | 33 | 54 |
| Donoso Cortés (extremeño), <u>Ensayo sobre el Cat- olicismo</u> , etc.; pp. 3-86 (Madrid, 1851).... | 4 | 35 |
| Olózaga (logroñés), y Martínez de la Rosa (granadino), <u>Discursos en la Acad. de la Historia</u> (1858)..... | 16 | 14 |
| Hartzenbusch (madrileño), <u>preliminares al Quijote de Argamasilla</u> (1863)..... | 9 | 27 |
| Valera (cordobés), <u>Pepita Jiménez</u> , pp. 5-101, (Madrid, 1874)..... | — | 66 |
| Tamayo y Baus (madrileño), <u>Un drama nuevo</u> (1867 : Madrid, 1877)..... | 8 | 75 |
| Pérez Galdós (canario), <u>Gloria</u> , 100 págs. (Madrid, 1879)..... | 18 | 26 |
| Núñez de Arce (valisoletano), <u>El haz de leña</u> (Madrid, 1879)..... | 5 | 85 |
| P. A. de Alarcón (guadijeño), <u>Narraciones in- verosímiles</u> , pp. 9-119 (Madrid, 1882)..... | 42 | 14 |
| <u>Cantos populares españoles</u> , tomo 1, (Sevilla, 1882)..... | 116 | 3 |
| V. de la Fuente (aragonés), <u>Hist. de las univer- sidades</u> , tomo IV, pp. 384-447 (Madrid, 1889)..... | 37 | 13 |

From this investigation he finds that the use of le in the accusative for both persons and things reached the height of its development in the XVI and XVII centuries among the writers of Madrid and neighboring provinces, as,

Lope, Tirso, Calderón, Venegas, Mariana, Cervantes, Solís, Santa Teresa, and that this use has been extended to authors in other parts of the Peninsula who have resided a long time in Madrid and naturally have become accustomed to the usage of the Capital, the standard of culture for the provinces. To illustrate, Cuervo cites the example of the works of Samaniego and those of Iriarte, both of whom came from districts in which lo was used in ordinary speech. Samaniego, living mostly in the Basque provinces, was loista; Iriarte, who left the Canary Islands when quite young to live in Madrid, became leísta.

Cuervo therefore reasons that it is very natural that the use of le should attain a certain air of culture and that many who would ordinarily use lo when talking, would write le and thus that the usage of a given book may or may not correspond to that of its author's speech or to that of his particular province.

Among the eight authors mentioned above as exemplifying the culmination of the use of le in the accusative among writers of Madrid and the neighboring provinces in the XVI and XVII centuries, three, Lope and Tirso (Madrid) and Santa Teresa (Ávila) used le alone in the pages examined by Cuervo. Each of the other three writers mentioned use the lo, though very infrequently.

The proportion of 2 cases of lo and 101 of le as found by Cuervo shows a much greater preference for the former than

that indicated by Cejador ³⁷, and I am inclined to think that Cuervo's study was too limited to give an accurate standard on which to judge Cervantes' use of these words. This view is strengthened by the fact that in my own study of Pérez Galdós ³⁸ the use of lo prevailed in the first one hundred pages of the book but the reading of the entire book gave the opposite result. A similar occurrence was noted in the study of Pérez de Ayala, ³⁹

The one case of lo used by Mariana, he indicates, may be classified as neuter according to Bello. ⁴⁰ He states however that there are other cases of lo used accusatively in other pages of the same work not examined for his study.

He shows that it would be difficult to be well read in classical Spanish literature and be exclusively loísta in writing and, on the other hand that the most determined partisan of le must sometimes take cognizance of lo, sometimes required by rhyme and sometimes for the sake of clearness.

In conclusion he states that Castile is the center of the use of le, that lo predominates in Aragón and especially Andalucía and Extremadura, that outside the Peninsula, in the Canaries and in America lo is used exclusively; that in Portuguese and the dialects of Spain, only forms corresponding to lo are found in the accusative.

The use of les in the accusative for los is beyond all comparison less frequent than le for lo. Although in some of the works examined for the purpose of his study he finds no

37. *Vide Supra*, p. 5.

38. *La Fontana de Oro*, Leipzig, 1883.

39. *Prometeo*, Madrid, 1916.

40. *Gramática*, Par. 295.

examples of les for los, cases are found in the works of each author examined and he mentions Cervantes in whose work both Clemencín and Bello found examples.

Less common is the use of los for les in the dative, but its use is attested by its condemnation by the Academy. Le is sometimes found as feminine accusative for la but most of such cases may be explained as datives.

Only le and les were used in the dative until the end of the XV century but la and las are now used frequently among Spanish-speaking people, especially in Madrid, as Salvá⁴¹ observes. The construction of hablar with the accusative of persons, as frequently found in the plays of Lope, may account for this development as well as the similar use of lo and los. The exclusive use of these forms by Moratín and Iriarte gave this usage wider range. The use of lo in the dative is however very rare. Its less frequent use than los in the same case being due possibly to the influence of the similarity of the latter to vos and os.

In the neuter the dative is le and the accusative lo. It would not, however, be strange that leísmo should produce le as accusative neuter. Cuervo cites one example of this.

41. Fermosilla, Arte de hablar, p. 168.

CHAPTER I

THE MASCULINE ACCUSATIVE PRONOUNS

SINGULAR AND PLURAL

In latin many intransitive verbs took the dative; e.g., verbs expressing a state of mind, disposition, action, feeling or quality. These constructions included the dative of the indirect object and the object of reference, without conveying, however, any idea of the object being acted upon directly by the verb.⁴² In Spanish some of these verbs became transitive and others remained intransitive. The most important of these latin verbs were such as expressed "to be pleasing or displeasing, helpful or injurious, to command, yield or be obedient, to be friendly, partial or opposed, to spare, pardon, threaten, trust, advise, persuade, happen, meet."⁴³ Many of these verbs were transitive, however, and it is not strange that in Spanish confusion should arise in their use thus causing the first cases of misuse of the object pronouns.

It has been borne in mind that many Spanish verbs that appear transitive to the anglo-saxon mind, are classed as intransitive, e.g., doler is considered intransitive while the English to hurt, to pain is usually transitive. The reverse of this is also true: escuchar is transitive while to listen is intransitive. There are moreover a

42. Madvig, A Latin Grammar, Woods translation, London, 1882, p. 217.
Bennet, Syntax of Early Latin, Boston, 1914, Vol. II, pp. 104, 117.

43. Lane, A Latin Grammar, New York, 1903, pp. 202-203.

number of verbs that take either the dative or the accusative, depending upon the sense in which they are used,⁴⁴ as in the following examples :

"El reo debe contestar a la demanda ante el juez y escribano de la causa." (dative)

"Yo contesto en las mías (en mis cartas) todas las especies, y tú olvidas en las tuyas muchas de las que toco en las mías." (accusative)

There are others that take the dative of the person and the accusative of the thing⁴⁵ :

Le dijo la verdad.

In the determination of the transitive or intransitive use of verbs the Diccionario de construcción y régimen has been used where ever possible, and that of Salvá⁴⁶, Alemany⁴⁷, Donadiu Puignau⁴⁸, or Zerolo, Toro y Gomez and Isaz⁴⁹, where the verb sought was not contained in the first mentioned.

The natural tendency among the best writers of any country will be to use the most cultured forms of the language in which they write. Considering, then, that the norm of culture in Spanish speech and literature is that of Madrid, we should expect those authors who are from other parts of the country to show some marked tendency

44. Cuervo, Diccionario de construcción y régimen de la lengua castellana, Vol. II, Paris, 1893, p. 465.

45. Hanssen, Op. Cit., p. 176.
Vide Supra, p. 14.

46. Nuevo diccionario de la lengua castellana, 12th ed., Paris, 1904.

47. Diccionario de la lengua española, Madrid, 1917.

48. Diccionario enciclopédico de la lengua castellana, Barcelona, not dated.

toward the usage of the capital unless very strong influences intervened. If the best writers of Madrid with whose works other authors were acquainted used le for persons in the masculine accusative singular we should expect to find something of the same tendency at least among those from other provinces.

Since Cuervo's study does not show what proportion of his results in the masculine singular accusative is used for persons and what for things, we cannot use his findings as a basis for this part of the present study except in so far as it indicates a general preference for le. If, however, we find that foremost writers of Madrid prefer this usage and that those from other provinces show the same preference, we may conclude that the latter have been actuated by the desire to use the most cultured forms of the language. Especially will this be true of those who come from provinces in which other forms prevail.

While expecting to find this tendency toward the forms used in the capital, we shall also expect to find traces of the usage of the province of each individual writer.

1

In the following table are given the results of my investigation of the use of these forms (in the singular

masculine accusative) in works selected from various authors prominent in Spanish literature since the time covered by Cuervo's study. I have included, however, works of Pereda and Pérez Galdós, written during that period, the object being to determine what, if any, change occurred in their use of these forms within the period of their lives. The authors are grouped as far as possible according to the province of their origin. The first row of figures after each title represents the number of cases found of the particular use indicated and the numbers immediately below give the percent of usage of that form, the use of the two forms le and lo or les and los totaling one hundred percent in any given case.

| Castile | Persons | | Things | |
|---------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| | <u>le</u> | <u>lo</u> | <u>le</u> | <u>lo</u> |
| Picón, (Madrid) | | | | |
| <u>Cuentos de mi tiempo,</u> | 25 | 3 | | 10 |
| <u>Madrid, 1895</u> | 89 | 11 | | 100 |
| pp. 3-111. | | | | |
| Martínez Sierra, (Madrid), | | | | |
| <u>Sol de la tarde,</u> | 46 | 1 | 21 | 4 |
| <u>Madrid, 1904, 3rd.ed.,</u> | 98 | 2 | 84 | 16 |
| 1916, pp. 7-241. | | | | |
| Benavente, (Madrid), | | | | |
| <u>Teatro XXVI, Madrid,</u> | 67 | 2 | | 11 |
| 1919, pp. 11-210. | 97 | 3 | | 100 |
| López de Haro, (Cuenca), | | | | |
| <u>Entre todas las mujeres,</u> | 64 | 129 | 1 | 52 |
| <u>Madrid, 1910, pp. 9-</u> | 33 | 67 | 2 | 98 |
| 312. | | | | |
| Basque provinces | | | | |
| Baroja, (San Sebastián), | | | | |
| <u>La veleta de Gastizar,</u> | 56 | 3 | 3 | 12 |
| <u>Madrid, 1917, pp. 9-</u> | 95 | 5 | 20 | 80 |
| 238. | | | | |

| | Persons | | Things | |
|--|----------------|-----------|-----------|---------------|
| | <u>le</u> | <u>lo</u> | <u>le</u> | <u>lo</u> |
| Unanuno, (Bilbao), <u>Abel Sanchez</u> , Madrid, 1917, pp. 9-233. | 162 96 | 6 4 | 11 22 | 35 78 |
| Asturias | | | | |
| | 50 | | | |
| Pereda, (Santander), 51 <u>Escenas montanesas</u> , 1864, <u>Obras Completas</u> , 2nd ed., 1891, Vol. V, pp. 5-349. | 155 100 | | 56 67 | 27 33 |
| <u>Scitileza</u> , 1885, <u>Obras</u> <u>Completas</u> , Madrid, 1894, Vol. IX, pp. 5-558. | 384 100 | | 91 76 | 29 24 |
| <u>Penas arriba</u> , 1895 <u>Obras Completas</u> , Madrid, 1897, Vol. XV, pp. 5-639. | 225 100 | | 125 96 | 5 4 |
| Valdés, (Asturias), <u>Los majos de Cádiz</u> , Madrid, 1896, pp. 1V-XXVI and 1-103. | 75 87 | 11 13 | 1 4 | 25 96 |
| Pérez de Ayala, (Oviedo), <u>Prometeo</u> , Madrid, 1916 pp. 7-232. | 79 79 | 21 21 | | 23 100 |
| Galicia | | | | |
| Pardo Bazán, (La Coruña), <u>Morrión y boina</u> , <u>España</u> <u>Moderna</u> , 1889, Vol. 1, Jan., pp. 1-35 <u>Destripador de antaño</u> , Esp. Mod. 1890, Vol. 1, Jan. pp. 1-35. | 25 93 10 | 2 7 | | 3 100 5 |
| <u>Saludo de las brujas</u> , Esp. Mod. 1897, Vols. 1 and 11, Jan.-June, 161 pages. | 73 91 | 7 9 | 2 4 | 51 96 |
| Valle-Inclán, (Pontevedra), <u>La cabeza del dragón</u> , Madrid, 1913, pp. 7-160. | 19 79 | 5 21 | 1 7 | 15 93 |

50. Dialectically Santander is included with the Asturian provinces, though politically a part of Castile, Pidal, El dialecto leonés, Revista de archivos, Bibliotecas y Museos, Madrid, Vol. 14, Feb. Mar. 1906, p. 139.

| León | Persons | | Things | |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| | <u>1e</u> | <u>1o</u> | <u>1e</u> | <u>1o</u> |
| Alas, (Zamora), <u>Su único hijo</u> , 1890, | 246 | 7 | 11 | 33 |
| <u>Obras Ccpletas</u> , Madrid, 1913, pp. 5-371. | 97 | 3 | 25 | 75 |

Andalucía

| | | | | |
|---|----|---|----|----|
| Ganivet, (Granada) <u>Trabajos del infati-</u> <u>gable Pío Cid</u> , 1898, | 55 | 3 | 4 | 8 |
| Madrid, 1911, pp. 5-106. | 95 | 5 | 33 | 67 |

| | | | | |
|--|-----|--|----|----|
| León, (Málaga) <u>Los caballeros de la</u> <u>cruz</u> , Madrid, 1917, | 7 | | 2 | 4 |
| pp. 11-51. | 100 | | 33 | 67 |
| <u>La escuela de los</u> <u>sofistas</u> , 1910, | 39 | | 19 | 17 |
| 4th ed. Madrid, 1918, pp. 12-201. | 100 | | 53 | 47 |

Valencia

| | | | | |
|--|-----|----|----|----|
| Blasco Ibáñez, (Valencia) <u>Cuentos Valencianos</u> , | 118 | 18 | 3 | 14 |
| Valencia, 1895, pp. 5-261. | 87 | 13 | 18 | 82 |
| Martínez Ruiz, (Alicante), <u>Un Pueblecito</u> , Madrid, | 13 | | 8 | 9 |
| 1916, pp. 13-164. | 100 | | 48 | 52 |

Canary Islands

| | | | | |
|---|-----|----|----|-----|
| Pérez Galdós, <u>La fontana de oro</u> , 1867, | 431 | 24 | 16 | 80 |
| <u>Collección de autores</u> <u>españoles</u> , Leipzig, | 95 | 5 | 17 | 83 |
| 1883, Vol. XXXI, pp. 1- 370. | | | | |
| <u>La razón de la sinrazón</u> , | 37 | 4 | | 36 |
| Madrid, 1915, pp. 7-276. | 90 | 10 | | 100 |

51. I have taken those selections of Escenas montaÑesas which Pereda indicates as forming the first edition, Ibid., Introduction, p. 5.

These numbers do not include the cases of the use of these forms with the pronoun se used either as a reflexive pronoun or as a dative before another object pronoun of the third person. These uses will be treated separately.

Considering these groups of writers in the order in which they are listed above, we find that among the four writers from Castile the three from Madrid,⁵² Picón, Martínez Sierra and Benavente have used le for persons in approximately ninety percent of more of the cases where a masculine pronoun was used in the accusative singular referring to a person; that in the case of two, Martínez Sierra and Benavente, this proportion approaches very closely to one hundred percent; and, that in the case of the fourth author, López de Haro, lo is used more frequently than le although the percentage is not nearly so high, (67%). It is also significant that the one author of the group who favors lo should come, not from Madrid or its immediate vicinity, but from Cuenca, one of the more remote provinces of Castile, where influences other than that of the capital would undoubtedly be felt. The proximity of the province to Valencia, and especially to Aragón,⁵³ where the use of lo prevails, may account for this. It may however, be considered as an indication that in this part of Castile the form lo prevails and that possibly this same use would be found in other provinces of Castile not here represented, somewhat removed from the

52. All statements regarding the life and origin of authors

influence of the capital.

Of these same four authors, all but one, Martínez Sierra, have used lo, two of them, (Picón and Benavente) exclusively for the accusative singular of things. This exclusive use of lo for things by Picón and Benavente, coupled with their great preference for le for persons seems to indicate a tendency toward the ruling of the

Academy mentioned by Cuervo.⁵⁴ The use of lo by López de Haro does not indicate any such tendency because of his use of lo for persons as well as for things.

In the Basque provinces, the percentage for the use of le in the case of both persons and things corresponds very closely in the two authors whose names appear in the list. While the percentage for the use of this pronoun for persons is not as high as that of Benavente and Martínez Sierra, the average for the two compares very favorably with that for the three authors from Madrid. If the comparison is made with the results for all Castile, the percentage is much the higher in the usage of the writers from the Basque provinces. This comparison may not be sufficient to show the true relation of the use of these forms between these two provinces, but it does indicate at least the same tendency on the part of these three writers from Madrid and those from the Basque provinces. It is to be noted, however, that after studying

52. are taken from Cejador, Historia de la lengua y literatura castellana, Madrid, 1919, unless the contrary is indicated.

53. Vide supra, p. 23.

54. Vide supra, p. 16.

in Valencia, Baroja was graduated as a doctor in Madrid at the age of twenty-one and two years later returned to live in the capital. It would not be strange to find that this influenced his use of these pronouns. I have not learned whether or not a similar experience at a likewise comparatively early age may have affected Unanue in the same way.

Each of these writers has used lo for things in the masculine accusative singular in about eighty per cent of the cases found. This is a lower proportion than that found in the case of the three authors from Castile who favored this use of lo.

Among the writers from Asturias greater variance is again found. In the three books of this list written by Pereda no case of the use of lo in the masculine accusative for persons was found. In the case of Valdés, and of Pérez de Ayala, le is also used more than lo in the accusative. Perhaps the thing most noticeable in this group of writers is the use of le by Pereda even more than in the case of any of the writers from Madrid. This, coupled with the fact that in the use of this pronoun in the accusative for things, the results given above show a change from 67 percent in Escenas Montañesas, 1864, to 76 percent in 1885 and 96 percent in 1895, shows a much greater tendency toward the use of le in the accusative than that found in the case of any of the four authors mentioned as coming from Castile, among whom the highest percentage for the use of le in the accusative for things is 84, found in the case of Martínez Sierra.

The other two authors of this group use lo for things, one, entirely and the other very nearly so. Each of these three authors spent some time in Madrid, but it seems unlikely that this should have resulted in influences that would account for their use of these forms. Pereda, who spent but three years in Madrid as a student and returned to Santander to take up his literary work, shows the greatest tendency toward the use of le, while Pérez de Ayala who studied almost entirely within his own province and did not go to Madrid until later, and Valdés, who went there to study law, both show a less pronounced tendency toward the use of le in the case of both persons and things. It may be, however, that Santander as a political part of Castile has been much more subject to the influence of the capital than has the province of Asturias. Either this or the personal preference of Pereda for le developed through reading rather than residence in Madrid may explain the circumstance noted here.

Comparing the use of these authors with those of Madrid, we find that the three of the Asturian group have used le for persons in 92 percent of the possible cases while those from Madrid have used it in 95 percent. If the comparison be made with those strictly from the province of Asturias, we have 83 percent for this province and 95 for Madrid, which at least shows that both Pérez de Ayala and Valdés have retained some tendency toward the usage of their native province.

Turning now to the writers from Galicia, we find

that Pardo Bazán from La Coruña, who has lived mostly in Madrid, and made a determined effort to eliminate Galician constructions, has used le for persons in more than 90 percent of the cases. Valle-Inclán went to Madrid from Pontevedra (Galicia) at the age of 26 and uses le in 79 percent of the possible cases for persons.

In the case of the accusative for things, the situation is relatively the same but with slightly wider discrepancy between the usage of the two authors, Pardo Bazán using the lo in 93 percent of the cases noted and Valle-Inclán in but 75 percent.

Comparing this with the results for the authors of Madrid, we find in the case of those from Galicia an average of 85 percent in the use of le for persons. It should be noted however that Pardo Bazán approximates very closely to the percentage of usage of the authors from Madrid and that the difference is almost entirely due to the lower percentage for le in the work of Valle-Inclán.

Each of these writers shows a preference for lo in the accusative for things. It is especially noticeable that in the case of each usage Pardo Bazán approaches the more nearly of the two Galicians to the percentage used by the Madrileños considering that in the use of the accusative for things only the two who favored the use of lo are compared in this instance.

In the case of the one author from León whose name appears in the list, Leopoldo Alas (Clarín), le is used for person in a higher proportion of cases than that of the average for its use among writers of Madrid. In the

case of things however it is lower than the average among those who favor the same pronoun, lo.

Of the two writers from Andalucia, Ganivet alone uses lo for person and, he, in only 5 percent of the possible cases. In the case of the accusative of things, Ganivet shows a preference for lo, and León a less decided preference for le. It is possible that the different character of the works of these two men may have had some influence on the usage.

In the case of each writer the use of le for persons is higher than the average for the same usage among the writers of Madrid. This tendency toward the usage of the capital on the part of authors from a province in which lo prevails, according to Cuervo,⁵⁵ may be explained in the case of Ganivet, aside from the general reason given at the beginning of this section of the study, by his study of law, letters and philosophy in Madrid. In the case of León we must rely on the general reason mentioned, and his care in writing as shown in all his works. Although he spent some years in Santander he did not go to Madrid until 1901, when he was 24 years old and would probably have had his use of these pronouns too firmly established to be greatly influenced.

Among the writers from Valencia we find that Blasco Ibáñez, born of Aragonese parents (which might in itself have given him a preference for lo)⁵⁵, went to Madrid at

55. Vide supra, p. 23.

the early age of 17 and worked as a secretary for Manuel Fernández y González, writing while his employer dictated and even finished paragraphs himself that the latter had left uncompleted.⁵⁶ Such an experience at so early an age must have had a decisive influence in the use of different forms, especially in writing. In this study it was found that he used le in 87 percent of the cases in which the masculine singular refers to persons in the accusative, indicating a great preference for le but retaining evidence of his earlier acquaintance with lo in the same usage.

In contrast with this, is the case of Martínez Ruiz (Azorín), who, born in another section of Valencia (Alicante), did not come to Madrid until 22 years of age and in the book listed above used le for persons in every case of the masculine accusative.

In the accusative singular of things, Blasco Ibáñez shows a decisive preference for lo, though not in so great a degree as that shown among those authors from Madrid who favor lo in the same usage. Martínez Ruiz shows very little preference between the pronouns in this connection, it being practically negligible for the number of cases found.

Pérez Galdós, coming from the Canary Islands, where lo prevails in the accusative,⁵⁵ to study law in Madrid at the age of eighteen, shows in his first novel a preference for le equal to that shown by the authors from

56. Zamacoiz, Vicente Blasco Ibáñez, Madrid, 1910, p. 10.

Madrid. In the later one examined the preference is somewhat smaller but possibly not sufficiently so to warrant further comment, except in so far as it may indicate a tendency toward the use of lo. In La fontana de oro he used lo in 80 percent of the cases in which the pronoun is used to refer to things in the masculine singular, and in La razón de la sinrazón, fifty-three years later, he used only lo in this way. Except for the decrease in the percentage of the use of le for persons this would seem to indicate a tendency to follow the rule of the Academy.⁵⁷

From the foregoing, then, we may conclude that le is preferred for persons in the masculine accusative among authors from Madrid, but not necessarily by those from other parts of Castile, and that this preference amounts in some cases to the approximate exclusion of lo.

In regard to authors from the other provinces, the preference is for the same pronoun, but it is found that in general the preference in no province is as great as in the case of Madrid; that some individual writers, e.g., León, Pereda, Martínez Ruiz, seem to use the form le exclusively when referring to persons in the masculine singular.

The same concurrence as that found in the use of le for persons among writers of the capital does not exist in the case of the use of lo for things. It is in general, however, preferred among the writers not only of Madrid

57. Vide supra, p. 16.

but of Castile as well. Three of the four authors from Castile use the lo either exclusively or approximately so, showing a tendency on the part of some writers in Madrid at least, to use le for persons and lo for things according to the ruling of the Academy, as mentioned above.

Among the writers from other provinces the use of lo for things prevails, with varying degrees of preference, being particularly noticeable among the writers from Galicia. Of the entire list of authors, Pereda and Martínez Sierra show a great preference for le in this usage and León a slight one.

11.

In the case of the accusative plural pronouns for the masculine there is less uniformity of use. The results are given in the following table:

| | Persons | | Things | |
|---|----------|----------|---------|-----------|
| | les | los | les | los |
| Picón, <u>Cuentos de mi tiempo.</u> | 6 86 | 1 14 | 1 50 | 1 50 |
| Martínez Sierra, <u>Sol de la tarde.</u> | 1 17 | 5 83 | | 15 100 |
| Benavente, <u>Teatro XXVI.</u> | 19 57 | 18 43 | | 10 100 |
| López de Haro, <u>Entre todas las mujeres.</u> | 5 15 | 29 85 | | 18 100 |
| Baroja, <u>La veleta de Gastizar.</u> | 8 67 | 4 33 | | 4 100 |
| Unanuno, <u>Abel Sánchez.</u> | 4 33 | 8 67 | | 6 100 |

| | Persons | | Things | |
|------------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| | <u>les</u> | <u>los</u> | <u>les</u> | <u>los</u> |
| Pereda, | 8 | 26 | 1 | 34 |
| <u>Escenas montaÑezas.</u> | 24 | 76 | 3 | 97 |
| <u>Sotileza.</u> | 8 | 6 | 1 | 26 |
| | 57 | 43 | 4 | 96 |
| <u>Penas arriba.</u> | 3 | 41 | | 54 |
| | 7 | 93 | | 100 |
| Valdés, | 9 | 9 | | 22 |
| <u>Los majos de Cádiz.</u> | 50 | 50 | | 100 |
| Pérez de Ayala, | 6 | 12 | | 11 |
| <u>Prometeo.</u> | 33 | 67 | | 100 |
| Pardo Bazán, | 4 | 2 | | 4 |
| <u>Morrion y Boína.</u> | 67 | 33 | | 100 |
| <u>Un destripador de antaño.</u> | | | | |
| <u>El saludo de las brujas.</u> | 19 | 11 | | 27 |
| | 63 | 37 | | 100 |
| Valle-Inclán, | 1 | 3 | | 3 |
| <u>La cabeza del dragón.</u> | 25 | 75 | | 100 |
| Alas, | 2 | 22 | 1 | 33 |
| <u>Su único hijo.</u> | 8 | 92 | 3 | 97 |
| Ganivet, | 2 | 3 | | 11 |
| <u>Trabajos del pío Cid.</u> | 40 | 60 | | 100 |
| León, | | | | 1 |
| <u>Los cabelleros de la cruz.</u> | | | | 100 |
| <u>La escuela de los sofistas.</u> | 7 | 1 | 1 | 29 |
| | 88 | 12 | 3 | 97 |
| Blasco Ibáñez, | 8 | 8 | | 3 |
| <u>Cuentos valencianos.</u> | 50 | 50 | | 100 |
| Martínez Ruiz, | 9 | 2 | | 6 |
| <u>Un pueblecito.</u> | 88 | 12 | | 100 |
| Pérez Galdós, | 32 | 26 | 1 | 26 |
| <u>La fontana de oro.</u> | 55 | 45 | 4 | 96 |
| <u>La razón de la sinrazón.</u> | 6 | 1 | | 8 |
| | 86 | 14 | | 100 |

An examination of this table shows that two of the four authors from Castile have used les more often than los in referring to persons. As would be expected, L6pez de Haro who used lo in the singular shows a great preference for los in the plural. Mart6nez Sierra, who mostly used le in referring to both persons and things also favors the use of los in the plural.

Among the writers from the other provinces equal divergence is shown in the choice of this pronoun. Of the two from the Basque provinces, one prefers les and the other shows an equal preference for los. Of the three from Asturias, Pereda, who used only le for persons in the singular, shows a preference for los in the plural as does P6rez de Ayala, while Vald6s shows no preference. Of those from Galicia, Pardo Baz6n prefers les and Valle-Incl6n, los. Alas, from Le6n shows a great preference for los. For the writers of Andaluc6a the results indicate a preference for les in the case of Le6n and a slight preference for los by Ganivet. Those from Valencia show a preference for les on the part of one and no indication of a preference on the part of the other. Gald6s shows a preference for les.

In the plural los is used to refer to things by all the writers listed above, although les appears at times, as might be expected from the confusion among the other usages of these forms.

CHAPTER II.

OTHER NON-ETYMOLOGICAL APPLICATIONS AND DISTINCTIONS

In the application of the principle of the use of le for persons and personified things and lo for things generally speaking, the former pronoun has come to be used often in reference to entities composed of persons, such as towns, or cities, an army or a city council or governing body and to the more intelligent animals, while lo is used to refer to persons when acted upon as a mere object or thing.⁵⁸ This tendency is quite marked in some authors.

Of the men examined, Pérez de Ayala is perhaps the most consistent in this usage, as applied to persons. The selections are from Prometeo:

"Salió por una puerta, y penetró por otra, furtivamente; subió a hurtar una sábana, y volvió a salir tan raudo como si Hermeias, Dios de eterna adolescencia, que⁵⁹ tiene alas en los tobillos, lo llevase en vilo."

In the following sentence the reason for the use of lo is not so clear.

"Arias besó la frente a su hermana, que se hallaba yerta de espanto, y salió corriendo. Dominica quiso arrojarse a detenerlo."⁶⁰

Speaking of a dog, in the following sentences when

58. Bello, Gramática Castellana, Paris 1916, p. 242.

59. p. 15.

60. p. 223.

he attributes certain mental qualities to him he refers to him with the pronoun le but uses lo when referring to him as acted upon as an object.

"Es un bicho que me odia, y yo le odio. Terminaré por matarlo.

-¿Qué dices, Arias? No harás tal.

-Sí haré, y ahora mismo.

Arias, embovecado y exasperado, cogió a Delfín por el cerviguillo y lo arrojó contra el muro, con toda su ⁶¹ fuerza."

Valdés shows a similar tendency but is less consistent perhaps in application of the principle, as shown in the following examples from Los majos de Cádiz.

"Frasquito estaba encendido y colérico que daba miedo a todos menos a su tío. Los circunstantes, temiendo algún paso desagradable, atajaron la disputa rogando ⁶² al señor Rafael que no le exasperase."

"-El tunante de tu hermanito se ha escapado de Medina y anda por ahí con otros perdidos. ¡Si pone los pies en esta casa cuenta conmigo!

Soledad prometió no recibirle si lo intentaba." ⁶³

"Sin decir palabra, con cólera muda, cayó sobre el infeliz muchacho, y a pescozones y puntapiés lo ⁶⁴ arrojó de la taberna."

In the following examples, however, among others

from the same work, the principle has not been applied.

"¿A mí, granuja- exclamó el caballero apeándose de un salto.

Y corriendo hacia el insolente alzó la mano y le tumbó
65
de un puñetazo."

"Paca no despreciaba por eso a su marido, como pudiera inferirse; al contrario, estimábalo como hombre de inteligencia penetrante, ya que había penetrado todo el mérito que ella poseía y seguía fielmente sus enseñ-
66
anzas filosóficas."

In Galdós this tendency appears at times but seems not to have been due to any definite principle. The following from La fontana de oro will illustrate his use.

"Vd. se disfraza de labriego, entra en la casa, y una vez allí...¡cataplum! le ha dado un desmayo, un accidente terrible. No tienen más remedio que dejarlo en casa...le meterán en un desván, y durante la noche, cuando ellas duerman, se apodera de la chica y... a
67
la calle."

"El de la cicatriz cogió por el cuello a Elías y con mano vigorosa le apretó contra el suelo.
68
-Suéltalo, Chaleco, déjalo tendido."

It is possible, of course, that Galdós meant to indicate no distinction by the use of lo in these sentences, but, that they are, rather, examples of his tendency toward the usage of the Canary Islands from whence

he came; or that in the case of the first example the intention was to indicate by the lo the supposed attitude of the inhabitants of the house as contrasted with that of the speaker.

Pereda uses le in referring to animals but this is to be expected in an author who uses this form for things as well as for persons.

"Tío Mocejón, barruntando que aquel asunto iba con él, recibió las palabras de Sobano y las miradas codiciosas de la gente, como un mastín el palo con que le hurgan los muchachos por debajo de la puerta." ⁶⁹

"Andrés tampoco tomaba parte en las empresas raqueriles de los muchachos del Muelle-Anaos; pero si en sus pedreas, en sus zambullidas, en sus juegos de agilidad, en sus intentos, casi siempre logrados, de atrapar un perro y arrojarle al agua con un canto al pescuezo." ⁷⁰

The striking thing about the use of this form by Pereda is that he uses it also for animals in the feminine accusative. The two examples cited here, however, are found in Peñas arriba, the work in which the freest use of le for things was found.

"Pero adentro de la viga anda la carcoma, asegúrotelo yo que la siento roer sin hora de descanso. (Aquí un amago de tos convulsiva). ¿No te lo dije? Pues a la vista le tienes ya." ⁷¹

The above is used figuratively of course but the reference is directly to carcoma. The other example is

69. Sotileza, p. 122.

70. Ibid., p. 67-8.

71. Peñas arriba, p. 62.

not figurative in any way:

"La presencia nuestra le contuvo (a la fiera) unos instantes en el umbral de la caverna."⁷²

Blasco Ibáñez also uses the distinction in the masculine accusative. A few examples from Cuentos Valencianos are given:

"El pobre valenciano, al plantar el arroz encorvándose sobre la charca, sentía en lo mejor de su trabajo algo que le cariciaba por cerca de la espalda, y al volverse tropezaba con el morro dragón, que se abría como si la boca le llegase hasta la cola, y ¡zas! de un golpe lo tituraba."⁷³

"Allí Pepet, un valentón rústico que usaba zapatos por la primera vez en su vida y había sido extraído de la Ribera por un dueño de timba, para colocarlo frente a los terribles Bandullos, que le molestaban con sus exigencias y continuos tributos."⁷⁴

These forms, le and lo are sometimes found in the same sentence as masculine accusative without any apparent reason for the use of both forms unless to avoid repetition of the same form, as in the following from López de Haro.

"Pero sus pacíficos designios se estrellaban siempre contra la fiereza de la onza, quien le (a Víctor) había de arañar, pinchar, pellizcar y morder hasta que lo exasperaba."⁷⁵ And,

72. Ibid., p. 379-380.

73. p. 256.

74. p. 167

75. Entre todas las mujeres, p. 206.

"No amaremos nuestro país, no le amaremos bien, si no lo conocemos," from Martínez Ruiz.⁷⁶

This also occurs in the plural.

"Lázaro les siguió a alguna distancia, comprendiendo que no era aquella ocasión para hablar a Bozmediano, pero se decidió a seguirlos hasta ver dónde paraban."⁷⁷

"Yo los sorprendí en la propia alcoba de Paco. Te lo ocultaba. Les sorprendí y me causó tal emoción, que no supe qué pensaba ni qué hacía."⁷⁸

Lo seems to prevail when refering to babies and very young children. Pérez de Ayala used lo five times for babies and le twice and in refering to the Spanish word pequeñelo he used lo five times and le once. Unanuno uses lo five times and le three times. Blasco Ibáñez used lo five times and le not at all.

79

Lo and los are sometimes used datively:

"¿Quiere Vd. una tasa de caldo? preguntó el clérigo; y se interrumpió antes de concluir, porque su hermana con tanta presteza como disimulo le tiró del manteo, indicándole lo la indiscreción de la oferta que acababa de hacer."⁸⁰

"En mi casa, a mis hijos, yo sólo los hablo de las virtudes de España."⁸¹

"Que los cortaron la cabeza en Calahorra; que los verdugos los echaron al Ebro."⁸² (dialectical)

76. Un Pueblecito, p. 96.

77. Galdós, La fontana de oro, p. 254.

78. Entre todas las Mujeres, p. 120.

79. Vide supra, p. 23.

80. La fontana de oro, p. 238.

81. Benavente, Teatro XVI, p. 134.

"Inútil era afearlos su conducta canalla."

"No lo estrellaran la cabeza contra el umbral del
toeril."⁸⁴

"Descoyuntó los huesos para chuparlo el tuétano."⁸⁵

Le sometimes appears as a neuter pronoun. The only cases found in the books examined for this study were the following:

"La energía es fuerza; el movimiento de la fuerza es gracia; la gracia es armonía y espíritu. El espíritu brota de la materia como de la fuerza la gracia, como el fuego del roce, como el fruto de la simiente, como el aroma de la flor.

-¡Buen galimatías! ¿Y a eso le llamas reconstituir el universo? Eso es hacer volatines con las palabras."⁸⁶

"Tenemos datos para creer que la devota no dijo esto con las mismas palabras empleadas en nuestro escrito, pero si el lector lo encuentra inverosímil, si no le parece propio de la boca en que le hemos puesto, considérelo dicho por el autor, que es lo mismo."⁸⁷

The following may be either a singular instead of the plural or a neuter use of le:

"Pues han de saber Vds. - dijo con misterio doña Rosalia, - que esta casa...Pues...le diré a Vds."⁸⁸

Le and lea are used in the feminine accusative by many authors though infrequently.

82. Sotileza, p. 421.

83. Eugenio Noel, Nervios de la raza, Madrid, 1915, p. 86.

84. Ibid., p. 187.

85. Ibid., p. 363

86. León, La escuela de los sofistas, p. 198.

87. Pérez Galdós, La fontana de oro, p. 247.

88. Ibid., p. 382.

Benavente;

"De las muchachas digo, lo mismo: hacen moda de jugar a las conspiraciones, les ilusiona bordar banderitas y cintas con lemas patrióticos, para los novios, para los
89
hermanos."

"Al abrazar mi cuerpo muerto, habéis de abrazar estas dos banderas, que estarán, siempre unidas en vuestro corazón como ahora sobre el mío. España, Patria de mis padres..., Patria mía, que eres también Patria de mis hijos, ...como podía yo separarles en mi corazón ni en
90
la vida ni en la muerte."

Martínez Sierra;

"Está el caserío roto en dos mitades: una en la cumbre, que es una meseta; otra en una rellano de la vertiente; y llamanle los aldeanos a la parte de arriba Rañueles
91
del Monte, y a la mitad de abajo Rañueles del Mar."

"A poco rato salió de la casa, coquetamente rebujada en la mantilla. Esperaba encontrar allí al compañante,
92
y le sorprendió mucho que se hubiese marchado."

López de Haro;

"Con siniestras intenciones de matar había salido de su casa. Matar al que por otra le había olvidado; al
93
que la despreció por otra."

"Le placía mucho a Nati estar así, en el almohadón,
94
reclinada sobre el asiento de cualquier mueble."

89. Teatro XXVI, p. 89.

90. Ibid., p. 155-156.

91. ScI de la tarde, p. 159.

92. Ibid., p. 121.

93. Entre todas las mujeres, p. 308.

94. Ibid., p. 82.

"Y la que clavó Víctor al no seguirla, al no buscar-⁹⁵
la inmediatamente, le pinchaba, le dolía."

Pereda;

"Pero estaba ésta comiendo un zoquete de pan que le
habían dado unos calafates, de pura lástima, y me
dijo que había dormido anoche en una barquía, porque⁹⁶
le habían echado de casa."

Pérez de Ayala;

"Estaba la marquesa entregada a las artes cosméticas,
en manos de una sirvienta que le peinaba con proli-
jidad y artificio, de manera que la rala pelambre⁹⁷
simulase la lozanía cabelluda de una res merina."

"Marco tomó la mano de Perpetua y le miró a los ojos,⁹⁸
embebidos en luz de luna."

"Fernanda hizo venir un ama, que relegó, junto con
Dominica y una criada vieja, a lo más apartado del
caserón, en cierta estancias traseras, pegadas al
huerto, de manera que la tropa menuda no le hur-
tase tiempo ni le fastidiase en quehaceres de gob-⁹⁹
ierno y afanes caciquiles."

Pardo Bazán;

"Pero he venido ajeno a esperanzas ambiciosas y he
abrazado las doctrinas de una filosofía egoísta...¹⁰⁰
ó llamenle ustedes como quieran."

95. Ibid. p. 154.

96. Sotileza, p. 24.

97. Prometeo, p. 50.

98. Ibid. p. 70.

99. Ibid. p. 174.

100. El saludo de las Brujas, España Moderna, Jan. 1897,
p. 15.

Ganivet;

"La Máscara rehusó al principio, y aceptó después una rodaja de salchichón y algunas galletas; y como el disfraz le estorbaba, se echó atrás el capuchón y se levantó un poco el antifaz,---" ¹⁰¹

Pérez Galdós;

"Doña Clara no amaba a su hija, ni a su esposo, y éste que le había amado mucho, concluyó por aborrecerla." ¹⁰²

"-La autoridad, niña, - exclamó Paz, - la autoridad es necesario...Ya nos ha mostrado Vd. suficientemente la influencia fatal que en Vd. han producido las ideas del día. El orgullo satánico, el rebelarse contra los superiores, el contradecir...Esto es insoportable. De este modo camina la sociedad a su ruina. Pero nos-
otras le traeremos a Vd. a buen camino." ¹⁰³

"El codo de Lázaro tocaba el codo de la devota, y esta tenía cruzadas las manos y la cabeza inclinada a un lado porque sin duda le halagaba el suave roce de las adelfas." ¹⁰⁴

"Pero a ver si baja la voz; que mi prima no puede sufrir esos gritos. Apenas entró Vd., yo no sé como pudo sentirle; lo cierto es que le sintió entrar, le conoció en los pasos, despertó con mucho sobresalto, y escuchó su voz, se incorporó en el lecho con mucha

101. Los trabajos de Pío Cid, p. 91-92.

102. La fontana de oro, p. 50.

103. Ibid., p. 144.

104. Ibid., p. 225.

agitación, manifestando que le molestaban mucho su
105
voz."

Unamuno;

" - Pero esta enfermedad me ha enseñado mucho, pero
mucho..

- Ah, le tomas como a un caso. " 106

"El relato de la muerte de Abel tal y como aquel ter-
107
rible poeta del demonio nos le expone, me cegó."

" - Es como lo de Carvajal, que no puede ver su hija
menor...

- Es que le ha llegada la última, seis años después
de la anterior y cuando andaba de recursos. Es una
nueva carga, y inesperada. Por eso le llama la in-
108
trusa."

The use of la and las in the feminine dative is
much more frequent than that of le and les in the fem-
inine accusative. The greater number of the authors ex-
amined use la and las in the dative at times, but most
of them do so infrequently. In the table given below
only those are listed whose books furnished examples of
this use. Only the most important percentages are given.

| | Persons | | Things | | Persons | | Things | |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| | <u>le</u> | <u>la</u> | <u>le</u> | <u>la</u> | <u>les</u> | <u>las</u> | <u>les</u> | <u>las</u> |
| Picón, <u>Cuentos de mi</u> <u>tiempo,</u> | | | | | | | | |
| Martínez Sierra, <u>Sol de la tarde,</u> | 70 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 1 | | | 1 |
| Benavente, <u>Teatro XXVI,</u> | 5 | 4 | | | | 1 | | |

105. Ibid., p. 256.

106. Abel Sánchez, p. 48.

107. Ibid., p. 88.

108. Ibid., p. 125.

| | Persons | | Things | | Persons | | Things | |
|---|-----------|----------|----------|----|---------|-----|---------|---------|
| | le | la | le | la | les | las | les | las |
| López de Haro, <u>Entre todas las</u> <u>mujeres,</u> | 153 86 | 24 14 | 1 100 | | | | 1 50 | 1 50 |
| Baroja, <u>La veleta de</u> <u>Gastizar,</u> | 7 | 2 | 1 | | 3 | | | |
| Pereda, <u>Escenas montañ-</u> <u>esas,</u> | 25 61 | 16 39 | 2 | 2 | 8 | | 2 | |
| <u>Sotileza,</u> | 108 54 | 91 46 | 2 | 10 | 7 | 4 | 3 | 1 |
| <u>Peñas arriba,</u> | 35 36 | 63 64 | 10 | 11 | 9 | | | |
| Valdés, <u>Los majos de</u> <u>Cádiz,</u> | 62 | 7 | 9 | | 5 | | | |
| Pardo Bazán, <u>Un destripador</u> <u>de antano,</u> | 11 | 1 | 1 | | 3 | | | |
| <u>El saludo de las</u> <u>brujas,</u> | 14 | 5 | 2 | 1 | | | | 2 |
| Alas, <u>Su único hijo,</u> | 98 | 18 | 4 | | 5 | 1 | 3 | |
| Ganivet, <u>Los trabajos de</u> <u>Pío Cid,</u> | 36 | 3 | 1 | | | | | |
| León, <u>La escuela de las</u> <u>sofistas,</u> | 5 | | 6 | 1 | | | | |
| Blasco Ibáñez, <u>Cuentos Valen-</u> <u>cianos,</u> | 19 63 | 11 37 | 1 | 3 | | | | |
| Martínez Ruiz, <u>Un Pueblecito,</u> | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| Pérez Galdós, <u>La fontana de</u> <u>oro,</u> | 208 | 1 | 8 | 1 | 25 | 1 | 1 | |
| <u>La razón de la</u> <u>sinrazón,</u> | 23 | 2 | 1 | | 5 | | 2 | 1 |

From this table it is seen that Pereda has used these forms in the dative more than any other writer of the list. The growth in the percentage of this usage, in the case of things, from 39 percent in Escenas monta-
ñaesas, to 46 percent in Sotileza and 64 percent in Peñas arriba, is not so pronounced as that noticed in his use of le in the masculine accusative,¹⁰⁹ but would seem to indicate either a conscious effort to use la and las in this way, or, since the usage often appears in dialect in his books, it may be that it indicates rather a decrease in conscious effort to avoid a usage to which he was accustomed, for a more accepted one. I am inclined to think that the latter is probably the case. His use of this form in the dative is not however limited to dialect, e.g.,

"Perdone, pues, la critica officiosa si, por esta vez,
¹¹⁰
la pierdo el miedo."

"Pero ¿merecería Sotileza este sacrificio? Merecería
siquiera el que se había impuesto él al jurarla lo que
¹¹¹
le juró."

As illustrated in the last example above he often uses le and la in the same sentence as feminine dative. His use of la does not seem to be for the sake of clearness alone, e.g.

"Muchas veces había intentado hablar con este tema a

109. Vide supra, p. 33.

110. Sotileza, preface, p. 5.

111. Ibid., p. 367.

su marido, y hasta conseguido fijar su atención por unos instantes; pero de allí no pasó nunca, por que Bitudra, que todo lo metía a barato, le salía al encuentro con una cuchufleta, pegándola una papuchadita y mordiéndola luego los carrillos, o tapándole la boca con un beso, después de haberla dado tres vueltas en el aire, entre sus brazos de hierro, en la misma postura que coloca un padrino a su ahijado mientras el cura le pone la sal en los labios." ¹¹²

"Y tomó a su mujer en brazos, como solía. Púsose enfrente del balcón, y diciendo: "¡a la una! ¡a las dos! ¡a las tres! columpiándola al mismo tiempo, giró de pronto sobre sus talones hacia dentro, y la estampó en la cara media docena de besos." ¹¹³

Likewise the use of these forms in the dative by other authors is not limited to cases in which the reference is made clearer by the use of la or las, and neither are they applied to persons alone, as illustrated by the following examples:

"Los niños ciegos pasan junto a las flores y no las ven: muchos de ellos no saben como son las flores, pero saben que están allí, dando aromas suaves, y que son ligeras y que son frescas, y que algunas de ellas tienen escondida muy dentro una gota de miel; y por todo esto las tienen cariño." ¹¹⁴

112. Ibid., p. 159.

113. Ibid., p. 162.

114. Martínez Sierra, Sol de la tarde, p. 214.

"¡Ay, amiga Dorotea!...Al oírla a usted casi me arrepiento de haber contribuido por mi parte a esta solución, que yo juzgaba, aún me ilusiono en juzgar satisfactoria para todos. La antigua y buena amistad que me unió siempre a la familia de Paulina, el cariño que siempre la tuve, no me impidió ser el más severo en condenar su indisculpable extravío." ¹¹⁵

"Temen estas gentes tanto al agua que se estremecen al verme echar a pechos por la mañana un vaso. Blasonan de no haberla catado en todo el año. También se conoce por sus rostros tiznados que no la tienen menos miedo para lavarse." ¹¹⁶

In the following example from Pérez Galdós la may be considered as used accusatively in reference to some indetermined object. I am inclined to think however that it is a dative pronoun referring to Paz:

"¿Quién es el amo de esta casa?

- Yo soy - dijo Paz un poco alarmado con el misterio que parecía envolver aquella inesperada visita.

- Pues vengo a decirla a Vd...¿Vd. no sabe lo que pasa?" ¹¹⁷

This indefinite use of la and las referred to above appears more frequently in the plural with se, e.g.

"Se remontaba a lo más alto de cuanto había oído y leído sobre aquella empingorotada región de la cordillera cantábrica, y era de ver como se las había, primeramente

115. Benavente, Teatro XXVI, p. 16.

116. Martínez Ruiz, Un Pueblecito, p. 141.

117. La Fontana de oro, p. 382.

con los celtas, nuestros supuestos cogenitores,.."¹¹⁸

"Sonrió Víctor. Se las había con un loco remat-
ado."¹¹⁹

Examples of this usage are frequent in La fontana de oro, though not usually used with se, e.g.

" - Está la casa sola. No puedo salir.

- Pues buena la hace Vd. si sale al momento y viene
conmigo a donde yo le lleve."¹²⁰

" - Padece mucho al verme así, exclamó (sic) Clara con dolor.

- ¡Oh! Las tres pécoras de esta casa me la han de
pagar."¹²¹

"Su tío al saber que el muchacho era exaltado y que
la echaba de orador, se puso echo un veneno,..."¹²²

This usage is found in many other writers examined for this study, though not so frequently as in the case of Pereda and Pérez Galdós. Examples from other authors follow:

" - A otro perro con ese hueso, Abel. Te conozco desde que nacimos casi. A mí no me la das. Te
conozco."¹²³

"Era una lástima que la fiesta terminase mal; pero entre hombres, ya se sabe: hay que estar a todo.

Dejar sitio y que se las arreglen los hombres como

118. Pereda, Peñas arriba, p. 16.

119. López de Haro, Entre todas las mujeres, p. 254.

120. La fontana de oro, p. 220.

121. Ibid., p. 233.

122. Ibid., p. 173.

123. Unamuno, Abel Sánchez, p. 13.

124
puedan."

"Y hay otros que parece que las cogen por el aire y,
125
sin embargo, no distinguen, ¿estamos?"

124. Blasco Ibáñez, Cuentos Valencianos, p. 173.
125. Valdés, Los majos de Cádiz, p. 100.

CHAPTER III.

IN COMBINATION WITH OTHER OBJECT PRONOUNS.

The variations in the use of these forms in combination with other object pronouns of the third person, are not always the same as those already discussed. ¹²⁶

While it was found that le prevailed for persons in the masculine accusative in the usual construction, e.g.- ¹²⁷

"-No sé quién es; le trajeron a noche,"

in combination with the dative pronoun se, lo is usually found. This is true of all these authors except Pereda, who used only le when one object pronoun was used. In this use of the accusative, le prevails in his works.

Pereda generally uses le as masculine accusative of things in this combination and lo only occasionally while in the other writers, lo prevails.

In the accusative plural los is preferred by all of these men except Benavente, who shows a preference for les.

In the feminine accusative no cases of the use of any other pronoun than la and las are found for both persons and things.

In the purely reflexive construction in which se appears in the accusative with another pronoun of the third person, in the dative, e.g.-

"Y por saberlo muy bien, no le era antipático Tolín,

126. See Chapters I and II.

127. La Fontana de oro, p. 108.

aunque jamás se le hubiera ocurrido echársele por cana-
rada de su preferencia;..."¹²⁸

le and les are used almost entirely, la and las appearing very rarely, and lo and los not at all.

"...sentía que una criatura deforme, ridícula, un
vegete arrugadillo, que parecía un niño Jesús, lleno
de pellejos flojos con pelusa de melocotón invernizo,
se la desprendía las entrañas,..."¹²⁹

The use of la in this construction occurs more frequently in Pereda than in any other writer of the group; using la four times in Peñas arriba and le once.

With the reflexive se in the dative and the other pronoun in the accusative, le was found in the feminine for persons three times and les two times. In the masculine, le prevails for both persons and things in the singular and los in the plural.

In the passive construction with se the feminine dative is usually le, but la occurs at times for both persons and things.

"Oír, no se la oye palabra, si no es pa responder a
lo que se la pregunta,..."¹³⁰

"-¿Déjela, madre, déjela, que con esa se mancha hasta
la basura que se la tire a la cara."¹³¹

The last two examples above are very similar to the impersonal construction, e.g.

128. Sotileza, p. 310.

129. Su único hijo, p. 177.

130. Sotileza, p. 213.

131. Ibid., p. 432.

"-Al que le diga algo atrevido a Verónica,...se
 le expulsa, señores, se le expulsa."¹³²

but not identical with it because a subject of the verb is expressed in each sentence.

In his study of these forms,¹³³ Cuervo shows that the reflexive construction of the third person in passive sense is used from the earliest periods of Spanish literature but mostly referring to things because of the danger, when referring to persons, of confusing the passive meaning with the purely reflexive or reciprocal. It was preferred when referring to persons, to use the passive formed with ser and the past participle.

Little by little the construction was applied to persons, leaving to the context the determination of the meaning. In the XVI and XVII centuries such sentences as the following were used, although rarely;

"Se mataban los cristianos."

"Se degollaron los catalanes."

The clarifying of such phrases was attempted in two ways: First, by using the preposition a before the name of the object that received the action.

"Fué recibido con grandes juegos é danzas como se
 suelen recibir a los reyes que de algún conquista
 vienen victoriosos,"¹³⁴

in which the author evidently was going to write,

"como se suelen recibir los reyes",

132. Morrión y Boína, p. 26.

133. Vide supra, p. 4.

134. Cron. Juan II. año VII, chap. XXI.

but the meaning being different than that which he intended to give, he had no other means of making reyes receive the action of the verb than to put a before it. Such sentences offer no difficulty in the singular because they are used as purely impersonal. In the plural however, they are held to be incorrect because of the incongruity that results from continuing the agreement of the verb with what has been converted into the object.

The other method of clarification was to turn to the similarity of such locutions as, "se dice, se manda, se hace agravio ú ofensa," which, although having a grammatical subject are logically impersonal and have their complement in the dative with a:

"Se dice, se manda, se ruega a los niños que vengan," and reproducing the object,

"se le (sic.), se les ruega."

For this reason the truly impersonal sentences take le, les and the use of los must therefore be regarded as a neological attempt to reconstruct these sentences on another model which is that of the French on.

Guervo points out that grammarians differ only in their way of looking at these questions. Salvá, in the third edition of his grammar, ¹³⁵ after establishing that se le is necessarily used in the masculine singular of these constructions and, ordinarily, se les in the masculine plural, adds:

"In as much as the second pronoun is in the accusative

in these sentences one cannot reprove Quintana for saying: 'Por grandes que se los suponga, Se los mantendría en el libre ejercicio de su religión, Si se los hace teatrales, dejan de ser pastoriles." -

and later this is changed to read:

"Not being certain whether the los (las etc.) is in the dative or accusative,".

He, Salvá, states that because of the break in the agreement in these sentences the pronoun is either dative or accusative. ¹³⁶

Cuervo asserts that this is inadmissible since lo cannot be used in the singular.

137

He then quotes the following from Bello:

"The verb of impersonal construction can take its customary regimen: 'Se pelea por el caballo;' 'Se vive con zozobra;' 'Se trata de un asunto importante.' But here a doubt arises: In the cuasi-refleja construction does the accusative remain as such or does it change in nature? When we say, 'Se admira a los grandes hombres;' 'Se colocó a las damas en un magnífico estrado;' should we consider these complements, a los grandes hombres, a las damas as true accusatives? I am inclined to think not. First because of the change of meaning that this construction produces in the verb: se coloca is se da colocación; se alaba is se dan alabanzas; a meaning which seems to demand preferably the dative. Second, because if the complement carries as object, the demonstrative él, we give

136. "Se halla bien en dativo, bien en acusativo."

137. Op. Cit., par. 791, p. 208.

it no other forms than those of the dative: 'Se les admira (a los grandes hombres), not se los admira.

Third, because if the complement has an indeclinable word as object it is absolutely necessary to place the preposition a before it, which in the dative of these words can never be omitted, as it may in the accusative: Thus, we say: 'Se obedece a los preceptos de la ley divina,' in the impersonal construction, or 'Se obedecen los preceptos' in the regular construction, making a los preceptos the subject; but we cannot say 'Se obedece los preceptos.'

Bello further says that in opposition to his view it may be argued that the use of la and las in these sentences indicates the accusative but that the argument is not conclusive because these forms are frequently used in the dative.

Discussing the opinion of the Academy, Cuervo shows that le, la, las were taken as accusatives and les as dative; that the frequent use of the latter form in such constructions was recognized, but, that it could have admitted that it is much more frequent than los. In reply to the argument based on the attempt to convert these sentences into the passive construction in order to show that in the latter construction the supposed dative would disappear, he argues that the sentences are already passive, as the Academy itself admitted in other editions ¹³⁸ of the Grammar,

that in the edition of 1880 this argument is omitted but the declaration that se is accusative is maintained. In view of the difficulties Cuervo concludes that it should be agreed that these constructions can not be made to conform to ordinary rules of syntax; that such distinct and opposite views are the outgrowth of the constant attempt to harmonize logical constructions with grammatical rules. "The phrases se les castiga, se les admira arising from analogy to se les dice or se les ruega eso o la otra, se les aplica el castigo, se les hace agravio, se les rinde homenaje, keeping the dative, appear without a subject. In order to make them conform to syntax it is necessary to find a subject. Those who are accustomed to the etymological use of these forms, sense le and les as datives and seek the subject of the passive verb. Those who are accustomed to hear le and les in the accusative take them as such and seek the subject in se, tending to give it, then, the quality of an indeterminate pronoun, as is done with uno, the French on and the German man.

In this conclusion, Cuervo reasons from the forms of the pronouns found in the construction and not from the history of these constructions and the purpose of the insertion of the preposition which latter method of approach cannot be neglected in any satisfactory solution of the problem.

I am inclined to think that Salvá was nearer to a solution of the problem involved, when he stated that the second pronoun in such constructions was sometimes dative and sometimes accusative, than Cuervo's statement and the discussion by Bello, indicate. He failed, however, judging from what

Cuervo has written of his discussion, to show when the construction would require the dative and when the accusative.

Citing again, Bello's first reason for not considering these forms as direct objects, i. e. because of the change of meaning that takes place in the verb, e.g.

"Se coloca is se da colocación,"

it is seen that this change is similar to that cited by Cuervo as one of the causes of confusion in the simple sentences, e.g. eso canso is equivalent to eso da cansancio, which similarity of meaning in sentences of different construction produced such sentences as the following, wherein le is feminine accusative:
139

"Un beso le consuela (a la paloma),"

the error probably being caused by the similarity to the expression, "le da consuelo," in which le is dative.

Taking a sentence similar to those quoted from Bello;

Se coloca la caja en la mesa,

Se da being equivalent to se da colocación, we can say

Se da colocación a la caja.

Caja is dative in the last sentence but we can not argue from this that it is also dative in the first.

These impersonal constructions developed long after the appearance of le as an accusative pronoun and when its use in that way was well established in Castile,¹⁴⁰ at least, which would seem to indicate that its use may have been due

139. Vide supra, p. 12.

140. Vide supra, pp. 3, 4, 21 and 62.

to that fact rather than to the feeling for a dative in such constructions. Bello's second reason, i.e., that when the object is the demonstrative él it is given no other forms than those of the dative, is therefore inconclusive. It would be interesting to note whether this construction originated, or was first largely used among leístas.

From Cuervo's treatment of the origin of these constructions it is clear that the preposition a was inserted in sentences like the one quoted, to indicate the object of the verb.¹⁴¹ This is still retained when the object is in any form except that of the atonic object pronoun. In his citation of this use of a as the third reason for his belief that these pronouns are dative in this use, Bello has failed to take account of this origin of the use of the preposition in this construction which is similar to its use in such sentences as, conoce al señor González, and, el adjetivo modifica al nombre, found in many grammars.

In regard to the use of such impersonal expressions as se dice, se manda, se ruega, se hace agravio, it is clear that in the examples given by Cuervo:

"Se ruega a los niños que vengan,"

"Se hizo agravio a los vecinos,"

a los niños, a los vecinos are used datively. If, however, we examine these examples we see that they are special types of these constructions. Any of the expressions se dice, se ruega, se manda, or the simple forms él dice, ruega, manda,

141. Vide supra, p. 62.

takes the dative of the subject of the subordinate clause. The direct object of ruega in the sentence above is que vengan. The expression se hizo agravio a los vecinos has for the direct object of the verb, agravio, which in the passive construction is the subject of the verb hacer;

Agravio era hecho a los vecinos.

or, in the active construction;

El hizo agravio a los vecinos.

Thus, los vecinos is in the dative in either case. But let us take another type of sentence:-

Se vió la pluma en la mesa.

La pluma is the subject of the verb ver and also receives the action of the verb and therefore has the offices of both subject and object. Now let us change the sentence to the active voice:

Uno vió la pluma en la mesa.

Pluma then remains in the same relation to the verb as was agravio in the sentence quoted from Cuervo, that is, accusative.

Taking, now, a sentence in which the verb is used actively with a direct personal object:

Uno vió a Juan a la puerta de la casa. Active

Juan era visto a la puerta de la casa. Passive

Se vió a Juan a la puerta de la casa. Ref. pass.

In the last sentence, a Juan is in the same relation to its verb as were agravio and pluma in their respective sentences.

Reproducing this object we have the sentence:

Se le (lo), vió a la puerta de la casa,

in which le, being in the same relation to its verb as a Juan

to that of the first and third sentences above, is accusative.

Taking a sentence in which the person is in the dative in the active construction:

| | |
|------------------------------------|-------------------|
| Uno da una peseta <u>a Juan</u> ; | active |
| una peseta es dada <u>a Juan</u> ; | passive |
| <u>se</u> da una peseta a Juan; | reflexive passive |
| <u>se le</u> da una peseta; | reflexive passive |

it is seen that the dative remains as such in each of these sentences.

Now taking another sentence in which Juan is in the dative and the sentence such as will give the purely impersonal construction:

Uno habló a Juan;
 Uno le habló;
 Se le habló;

in which the pronoun le in the last two sentences, and a Juan in the first, are in the dative.

From the above as well as from the purpose of the preposition a in the impersonal quasi reflexive construction, I conclude that the dative is required in these constructions in those cases in which the similar active sentence would require it; that the accusative is required when the verb of the impersonal sentence would require the accusative in the similar active sentence.

Thus Alas uses las in the following sentence:-

"Emma y Marta se entendieron pronto, y a las pocas semanas de tratarse con frecuencia y confianza, ya se las

oía, allá a lo lejos, en el gabinete de la Valcárcel,
 142
 ..."¹⁴² and los in this one:

"Aquellos gorgoritos de pavo alborotado se los
 hacía perdonar siempre a fuerza de gracia, amabilidad y
 143
 chiste."

"Y aun sospecho, que muy poco he de encubrir, por-
 que los numerosos disparates que mi amigo cometió lo
 fueron solo en apariencia, y dejan de serlo cuando se los
 mira en el conjunto de su extraña vida, con los ojos con
 144
 que él, al realizarlos, los miraba."

"Por de pronto, a Pepeta y al Cubano se los pasa-
 145
 ba por tal y cual sitio."

In the feminine, la and las are used much more fre-
 quently than le and les which are also the forms usually found
 in the masculine accusative.

The following examples are arranged according to the
 case of the pronoun:

La accusative;

"La hermana ropera es este mes Sor Gracia. Se la
 oye ir y venir prestamente sobre el entarimado lustroso,
 146
 y mientras va y viene, charla con Toñín."

"Pero desde aquel momento no perdieron de vista a
 la pobre huérfana, que, a juzgar por su impasible contin-
 ente, parecía ser la menos interesada de todos en la vida
 que arrastraba en el presidio a que se la había condenado,

142. Su único hijo, p. 215.

143. Ibid., p. 246.

144. Los trabajos de Pío Cid, p. 6.

145. Cuentos Valencianos, p. 31.

146. Sol de la tarde, p. 228.

creyendo hacerla un favor."

"La vida es buena o es mala, triste o alegre, según
el cristal con que se la mira." 148

La and le feminine accusative;

"Muchas veces se la veía en medio del bosque con el pelo suelto y una corona de flores silvestres, también se le había visto al lado de un arroyo que formaba un remanso, sentada con un manojo de harapos y cantando como si tuviera un niño en brazos." 149

Le and les masculine accusative;

"Y estos hombres, despechados porque no se les ve en la grandeza del mundo, quieren partir el mundo en pedacitos, por si en uno de estos pedacitos pueden ellos parecer grandes." 150

"-Siga usted su camino, señorito, y no se meta donde no le llaman..!No sea que se le apee del jaco por las orejas!--" 151

"La pura verdad es que ya nadie le hacía caso, y que se le tomaba de broma en todas partes." 152

Le and les dative;

"Temían los amotinados que se les hubiera engañado." 153

"Cuanto más se alargaban las filas hacia la casona, más bultos surgían de la obscuridad del agrio declive.

147. Sotileza, p. 79.

148. La escuela de los sofistas, p. 86.

149. La veleta de Gastizar, p. 134.

150. Teatro, XXVI, p. 101.

151. Los majos de Cádiz, p. 38.

152. Morrón y boina, p. 22.

153. Prometeo, p. 229.

Se les veía moverse;"

There has been much confusion over the case of the reflexive se. If we take the usual case of the reflexive se with a transitive verb;

El hombre se levantó.

El hombre se quitó el sombrero.

We have in the first case se accusative and hombre combines the office of subject of the verb with the accusative character of se, for hombre logically receives the action of the verb. In the same way, se in the second example being dative, hombre combines the office of subject of the verb with the dative character of se.

In the impersonal construction as shown in Cuervo's study, se was originally introduced referring to the same thing or person referred to by the second pronoun, 155
lo, los, le etc. and as such was and remains in these impersonal constructions, in the same case as lo, los, le, and indicates only the passive character of an original construction whose agent was unexpressed and whose subject having been converted into an object, has taken on the appearance and force of an active construction:

Se accusative;

"O porque su madre le hubiese transmitido sus gustos aristocráticos, o porque llevase dentro de su alma un

154. Peñas arriba, p. 512.

155. Vide supra, p. 62-63.

cierto sentimentalismo romántico, es lo cierto que jamás se le vió en francachelas, ni corriendo novillos, ni en compañía de toreros y majos como otros caballeros de su edad." ¹⁵⁶

Se dative;

"Tanto que una mañana se le vió enderezar el espinazo ¹⁵⁷ asaz encorvado;"

The subject of the verb in these constructions is vague and unknown and therefore not expressed, as in the case of the sentence where the indefinite idea is rendered by the plural of the verb, e.g.

"Cuentan de un sabio que un día

Tan pobre y mísero estaba (Calderón)." ¹⁵⁸

The Grammar of the Academy ¹⁵⁹ and Padilla ¹⁶⁰ condemn

the use of se in constructions similar to that of the French "on est content," "se vive feliz," which should be rendered "se vive felizmente," because the first rendering indicates a tendency to use se as a nominative.

The Academy regards the question of the case of the pronoun as more theoretical than practical because le represents both the dative and accusative. However it does not recognize the change in the nature of the complement of the verb as held by Bello. It points out that such a change would cause great confusion in the feminine and that we can say;

156. Valdés, Los majos de Cádiz, p. 43.

157. Pardo Bazán, Morrion y Boña, p. 14.

158. Quoted by Padilla, Gramática de la lengua española, Madrid, 1919, p. 185.

"Se colocó a las señoras en el estrado."

"A las señoras, se las colocó en el estrado."

but that we cannot say;

"Se les colocó,"

as we would have to say if the dative were admitted in these sentences.

The irregularity in these sentences is found in the disagreement in number of the reflexive se with the verb when the object is plural.

159. Edition of 1920.

160. Gramática histórico-crítica de la lengua española,
Madrid, 1919.

CONCLUSION

The object pronouns of the third person, la, las, lo, los etc., having developed from accusative forms of the latin are etymologically accusative and le, les, coming from the dative forms of the same language, are etymologically dative. Through morphological and syntactical causes, le appeared in the early development of the language as an accusative pronoun.

The proper use of these forms was discussed by grammarians as early as the latter part of the XV century and as this non-etymological use was more widely adopted and became predominant in some sections, especially in Madrid, these discussions became more frequent and developed into real controversies. The question remained unsettled however and the Academy finally decided in favor of the use of both lo and le in the accusative masculine singular but only los for the masculine plural of the accusative. It admitted la and las as feminine datives but later condemned their use in that case.

Guervo, by examining the use of these forms among authors from the earliest documents until 1889, found that the use of le in the masculine accusative singular reached its height of development in writers of Castile in the XVI and XVII centuries and that since that time its use has spread to other parts of the country until it has become the form most used in the singular of the masculine accus-

ative in literature. He indicates that in most of the regions in which Castilian is spoken the etymological use of these forms prevails.

The use of le for persons and lo for things as advocated by Salvá and later by the Academy, as a solution of the problem has not been applied consistently by the majority of writers. Although most of them use le for persons, they also use the same pronoun for things, at times and, likewise, lo for persons. The principle of the application of lo to both animals and persons when acted upon as mere objects and of le when mental qualities are attributed to them, is not universal in use, but may be regarded as a tendency quite pronounced in some authors. The use of lo when referring to babies and children is perhaps due to the same underlying attitude but seems to be more general.

161

Padilla, who gives for the masculine accusative singular, le and sometimes lo, declares himself in favor of the use of le for persons (or personified objects) and lo for objects, and states that the Andalusians abuse the use of lo, applying it almost exclusively to both persons and things in sentences like the following, which he quotes:

"¡Cuidado si está el chico que da gloria verlo!

(P. A. de Alarcón)."

This agrees with Cuervo's statement that lo prevails in Andalucía. I do not however find that this is true of

the two authors from Andalucía examined in this study. The example cited by Padilla may be a case of the tendency noted above to use lo in referring to children. He also says that in Madrid, le is used abusively for things and quotes the following:

"Llegó su complacencia hasta el extremo de pedirme el borrador, que conservaba, y leerle todo. (M. Romanos.)"

In the edition of its Grammar of 1916 the Academy still retains the ruling first announced in 1854 that le and lo are admissible in the masculine accusative without preference for either. In the edition of 1920, it states that le should represent the dative singular without distinction of gender and la and lo the accusative, but that usage assimilated the le to the analogous forms me and te and employs it, le, indiscriminately as accusative, and that it (the Academy) has compromised in part with usage, recognizing the dative form le as an accusative of equal value with lo, but that it would be better for writers to pay more attention to etymology than to usage, and employ le for the dative only.

The Academy further condemns the use of la and las as feminine dative and emphasizes the distinction of case rather than of gender in the dative, and with its recognition of only la, lo, las, and los as accusative forms, thus declares itself in favor of the etymological use of the pronouns of the third person.

Padilla likewise condemns the use of la and las in the dative, which occurs in a number of authors but as

a rule is not followed consistently.

The use of les in the masculine accusative for persons, and less often for things, is more frequent but shows no fixed principle other than the tendency resulting from the general use of le in the accusative, especially for persons.

The use of le as feminine accusative is much less frequent, and occurs more often with persons than with things.

Lo and los in the dative and le in the neuter are seldom found.

The non-etymological uses, in literature, of these forms, other than those of le and les in the masculine accusative and la and las in the feminine dative, occur so infrequently as to be of little importance and it is very unlikely that their use should ever become general.

The possibility of distinction of gender by the use of la and las in the feminine dative, might be considered a sufficient reason for their use becoming general. The fact that such use would, however, destroy the distinction of case seems to be sufficient to counteract the further development of this tendency.

In the impersonal quasi-reflexive construction, the case of the pronouns le, lo, la, les, etc. are generally accepted as dative regardless of their usual accusative construction.

The forms le and les having been established in these sentences by long usage, it is doubtful that they

will ever be replaced in the accusative construction, by the etymological forms lo and los.

The use of les in the masculine accusative seems to be the natural result of the use of le in the singular of the same case and with the increased use of le might be expected to become more general.

The fact that le in the masculine accusative has gained such a wide use in literature, would seem to make it improbable that the use of lo in this case would ever again be exclusive. The use of lo for things and le for persons and personified things is not widely accepted or, if accepted in principle, is applied consistently by but few authors.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books examined:

Alas, Leopoldo: Su único hijo, Madrid, 1890,
Edition of 1890.

Baroja, Pío: La veleta de Gastizar, Madrid, 1917.

Benavente, Jacinto: Teatro XXVI, Madrid, 1919.

Blasco Ibáñez, Vicente: Cuentos valencianos, Valencia,
1895.

Ganivet, Angel: Los trabajos del infatigable Pío Cid,
Trabajo primero, Madrid, 1911.

León, Ricardo: Los Caballeros de la Cruz, Madrid, 1917.

_____ : La escuela de los sofistas, Madrid, 1910:
Edition of 1918.

López de Haro, Rafael: Entre todas las mujeres, Madrid,
1910.

Martínez Ruiz, José: Un Pueblecito, Madrid, 1916.

Martínez Sierra, Gregorio: Sol de la tarde, Madrid, 1904.

Palacio Valdés, Armando: Los majos de Cádiz, Madrid, 1896.

Pardo Pazán, Emilia: Morrión y boín. España Moderna,
Madrid, 1889, Vol. I Jan.

_____ : Un destripador de antaño, España
Moderna, Madrid, 1890, Vol. I
Jan.

_____ : El saludo de las brujas, España
Moderna, Madrid, 1897, Vols. I-II,
Jan.-June.

Pereda, José María de: Escenas Montañesas, Madrid, 1864.
Obras completas, Madrid, 1894.

_____ : Sotileza, Madrid, 1885, Obras
completas, Madrid, 1894.

_____ : Peñas arriba, Madrid, 1895,
Obras completas, Madrid, 1897.

Pérez de Ayala, Ramón: Prometeo, Madrid, 1916.

Pérez Galdós, Benito: La fontana de oro, Madrid, 1867,
Colección de autores españoles,
Vol. XXXI, Leipzig, 1883.

_____ : La razón de la sinrazón, Madrid,
1915.

Picón, Jacinto Octavio: Cuentos de mi tiempo, Madrid,
1895.

Unamuno, Miguel de: Abel Sánchez, Madrid, 1917.

Valle-Inclán, Ramón de: La cabeza del dragón, Madrid,
1913.

Books of reference:

Alemany, José: Diccionario de la lengua española,
Madrid, 1917.

Bello, Andrés: Gramática Castellana, 18th edition,
Paris, 1916.

Bennet, Charles E.: Syntax of Early Latin, Vol. II,
New York, 1914.

Cejador y Frauca, Julio: La lengua de Cervantes, Madrid,
1905.

_____ : Historia de la lengua y liter-
atura castellana, Madrid, 1919.

Cuervo, José Rufino: Los casos enclíticos y proclíticos
de tercera persona en castellana,
Romania, Vol. XXIV.

_____ : Diccionario de construcción y re-
gimen de la lengua castellana,
Paris, 1886, 1893.

Donadiu y Puignau: Diccionario enciclopédico de la len-
gua castellana, Barcelona, not dated.

Ford, J.D.M.: Old Spanish Readings, New York, 1911.

Gómez, Fernando Arauyo: Gramática del Poema del Cid,
Memorias de la Academia es-
pañola, Madrid, 1896.

Hanssen, Federico: Gramática histórica de la lengua
castellana, Halle, 1913.

- Lane, George M: A Latin Grammar, New York, 1903.
- Madvig, I. N: A Latin Grammar, London, 1882.
- Menendez Pidal, Ramón: Cantar del Mio Cid, Gramática,
Vol. II, Madrid, 1906.
- Meyer-Lübke, Wilhelm: Grammaires de Langues Romanes,
Paris, 1900.
- Padilla, Salvador: Gramática histórico-crítica de la
lengua española, Madrid, 1919.
- Puignau, Donadiu, see Donadiu.
- Real Academia Española: Gramática de la lengua española,
Editions of 1904, 1906 and 1920.
- Salvá, Vicente: Nuevo Diccionario de la lengua castellana,
12th edition, Paris, 1904.
- Viñaza, Conde de la, (Munoz y Munzano, Cipriano): Biblio-
teca histórica la filología castellana,
Madrid, 1893.
- Zamacoiz, Eduardo : Vicente Blasco Ibáñez, Madrid, 1910.
- Zerolo, Toro y Gomez and Isaz: Diccionario enciclopédico
de la lengua castellana,
Paris, 1895.

Index

- Academia Española- 6, 7, 9, 16, 32, 64, 73, 74, 76, 77.
Alarcón, P. A.- 76.
Alas, Leopoldo- 30, 35, 36, 40, 41, 53, 60, 69, 70.
Alemany, José- 26.
Argüelles- 14.

Baroja, Pío- 28, 32, 33, 39, 41, 71.
Bello, Andrés- 8, 12, 14, 23, 24, 63-67, 73.
Benavente, Jacinto- 28, 31, 47, 49, 52, 56, 59, 71.
Bennet, Charles, E.- 25.
Berceo- 1, 16.
Blasco Ibáñez, Vicente- 30, 36, 37, 40, 46, 53, 57, 58, 70,
76, 77.

Calderón de la Barca- 19, 22, 73.
Cejador y Frauca, Julio- 3, 23, 31.
Cervantes- 3, 19, 22, 23.
Cid- 3, 10, 17.
Clemencín- 21, 24.
Confusion, beginnings of, 2, 3; causes of, morphological-
10-12, syntactical-12-16,
25.
Correas, Gonzalo- 5, 6.
Cuervo, José Rufino- 3, 4, 10-16; Table, of results for le
and lo masc. acc., 16-21; 22-24, 27, 32, 36, 61-68,
75.

Derivation- la, le, lo, etc.- 1; se dative- 1, 2; se re-
flexive, 2.
Donadiu y Puignau- 26.

Ford, J.D.M.- 2.

Franciosini- 5.

Ganivet, Angel- 30, 36, 40, 41, 51, 53, 70.

Garcés,- 6.

Garcilaso- 4, 18.

Gómez, Fernando Arauyo- 3.

Guevara- 13, 18.

Hanssen, Federico- 1.

Hermosilla- 7, 24.

Illam, -as, illum, -os, illi, -s, illi illud se lo- 1.

Impersonal construction- 61-75. Subj. of- 72.

Indefinite pronoun la, las- 56, 58.

Isaz- 26, 27.

Iriarte- 20, 22.

L'- 10, 11.

La, las, Acc.- 1, 3, 10, 11, 75, 77; Fem. Dat.- 3-10, 24,
52-56, 75, 78; indefinite pronoun, 56-58.

Lane, George M.- 25.

Le, lea,
Dative- 1, 3-10, 11, 75.

Fem. Acc.- 3, 48, 52-55, 78.

Masc. Acc.- 3-10, 11, 16-21, 23, 24, 75, 77-79;
of persons- 27-32, 35-41, 59, 77;
of things- 28-30, 32, 35-40
Personified things and animals- 4, 42-46, 79.

Le neuter- 24, 48.

Le masc. and lo in one sentence- 46, 47.

Leístas- 7, 8.

León, Ricardo- 30, 36, 39-41, 48, 53, 71.

Lo, los, Acc.- 1, 3-10, 16-21, 23, 24, 70, 77, 79.
of persons- 3-10, 36-41, 79.
of things- 3-10, 28-30, 32, 34-40, 79.

Lo, for babies and children- 47, 76.
for persons as objects- 42-46, 76.

Lo, los dative- 3-10, 24, 47-48.

Loistas- 7, 8.

Lope de Vega- 19, 22.

López de Haro- 28, 31, 39, 41, 46, 47, 49, 50, 53, 56.

Luna, Juan de,- 5.

Madvig- 25.

Man- 65.

Martín Cordero, Juan- 4.

Mariana- 20-23.

Martínez de la Rosa- 20-9.

Martínez, Gómez- 6.

Martínez Ruiz- 30, 37, 40, 41, 53, 56.

Martínez Sierra- 28, 32, 33, 41, 49, 53, 55, 70.

Meyer-Lübke, Wilhelm- 15.

Miranda, Juan de- 4.

Nebrija- 3.

Noel, Eugenio- 48.

On- 65.

Oudin- 5.

Oliván, Alejandro- 8-10.

Padilla, Salvador- 73, 36, 77.

Palacio Valdés, A.- 29, 33, 34, 40, 53, 72, 73.

Pardo Bazán, Emilia- 29, 35, 50, 53, 61, 71, 73.

Pereda, José María de- 28-30, 33, 34, 41, 45, 46, 50, 53-57,
59, 60, 70, 72.

Pérez de Ayala, Ramón- 29, 33, 34, 40, 41, 50, 71, 76.

Pérez Galdós, Benito- 23, 27, 30, 37, 38, 40, 41, 51, 53, 56,
57, 59.

Picón, Jacinto Octavio- 28, 31, 32, 39.

Puignau, see Donadiu.

Quintana- 20, 63.

Rey de Artieda, Micer Andrés- 4.

Roa- 18, 19.

Rodríguez, Carlos- 5.

Romanos, M.- 77.

Salvá, Vicente- 7-9, 16, 63, 65, 76.

Samaniego- 20, 22.

San Pedro, Benito- 6.

Santa Teresa- 18, 22.

Se (ge) dative, la, le, lo, etc.- 31, 59.

Se reflexive- 31; dative and acc. with la, le, lo, etc.- 59, 60.

Se reflexive in impersonal construction with la, le, lo, etc.

61-75, 78, 79;

with la, lé, acc.- 63, 64, 66-69, 72, 73.

la, le dative- 63, 65-69, 73.

with lo and los- 63, 64, 70.

with la and las- 70, 71.

with le and les acc.- 71.

with le and les dative- 71, 73.

se acc.- 72, 73; dative- 72, 73.

Se la, las in indefinite expression- 56, 58.

Se in passive construction with le,la,lo, etc.- 60, 61.

Solís- 20, 22.

Toro y Gómez- 26.

Tirso de Molina- 19, 22.

Unamuno, Miguel de- 29, 32, 33, 39, 41, 47, 52, 57.

Valle-Inclán- 29, 35, 40, 41,43, 44.

Valbuena- 10.

Venegas- 18, 22.

Verbs, transitive and intransitive- 25, 26, 40, 41.

Villar, Juan de- 5.

Zamacoiz, Eduardo- 30.

Zerolo, Toro y Gómez, and Isaz, 26.